Fifth Edition.

AN

ADDRESS

TO THE

PEOPLE OF IRELAND,

ON THE SUBJECT OF THE PROJECTED

UNION.

BY THOMAS GOOLD, ESQ.

"YOU ARE AT POINT TO LOSE YOUR LIBERTIES,
"MARCIUS WOULD HAVE ALL FROM YOU."
CORIOLANUS.

DUBLIN:

PRINTED BY JAMES MOORE, COLLEGE-GREEN.

1799.

BRITISH MUSEUM
28 47
MAR

AN

ADDRESS, &c.

THERE are certain conjunctures in which it is imperative on every individual to contribute his mite, whether bodily or intellectual, to the ſervice of the State. The machinations of intereſted ambition, working upon a profligate facility of corruption, are but ill combated by the quieſcent conſciouſneſs of patriotiſm and integrity. There is no conteſt ſo unequal as that between the exertions of vice and the indolence of virtue. A ſentiment of honeſt alarm is as much to be revered, as a puſillanimous fear is to be deſpiſed. The one is the reſult of every thing that is noble, the other of every thing that is pitiful in the human heart. The vigilance to guard, and the anxiety to preſerve it, are no mean atteſtations to

the goodneſs of any human inſtitution. The conſtitution of any country muſt be contemptible and precarious, where the ſlighteſt menace will not put hoſts of its people in the immediate poſture of defence. The conſtitution of this country has little to dread from open undiſguiſed hoſtility; ſuch a ſpecies of warfare tends naturally to unite even a divided people in a common cauſe: the united people of Ireland are invincible. No miniſter on earth will ever entertain the project of forcing the people of this iſland to be the ſturdy, unwilling ſlaves of oppreſſion; ſuch a meaſure might terminate in the diſgrace and ruin of the aſſailant. A policy more mean and miſchievous has ſuggeſted, that thoſe whom force could not ſubdue, treachery might ſacrifice. No miniſter, however daring, will promiſe himſelf much from the deficiency of our courage, or the inferiority of our ſtrength; we never can be the victims of his power, however we may be the dupes of his artifice. In no point of view, however, can Ireland be loſt but by Ireland. As the exertions of power are to be repelled by force, ſo are the expedients of cunning to be defeated by detection: in ſuch caſes, the ſword and the pen are alike inſtruments of defence. I do not flatter myſelf that my abilities could be of any ſerious uſe on a queſtion of much difficulty and delicacy:

delicacy: but ſure I am that feelings ſuch as mine, conceived, not in any abject terror of authority, nor in any ſaucy turbulence of faction, and delivered with the decency and ſpirit which becomes a freeman, are no deſpicable ingredients in a good cauſe. If I miſtake not, my motives never can be miſconſtrued: it is never difficult to diſtinguiſh between the kindneſs of friendſhip, and the officiouſneſs of interference. Without any further preface or apology, I ſhall proceed to ſtate to you my opinions on the queſtion of an incorporating legiſlative Union between Great Britain and Ireland.

It may not be inexpedient or unentertaining to give in this place an anecdote of undoubted authenticity. It is mentioned by Dalrymple, in the third volume of his Memoires, laſt quarto edition, appendix, page 48, and is in the following words:

ANECDOTE.

"It was intended in April, in the year 1776, "that the late Earl of Rochford, with whom I "had the honour to live more like a brother than "a friend, ſhould ſucceed the Earl of Harcourt "in the government of Ireland.

"Lord Rochford ſhewed me his Majeſty's note "about it, and ſaid he had aſked time from his "Royal Maſter to conſider. He told me his rea-

" ſon for doing ſo was, that as continual reſi-
" dence in Ireland for three years, was the un-
" derſtood condition of his going there, he could
" not ſubmit at his age to ſo long an exile, unleſs
" he could do ſome great good there, and get
" ſome great fame: that two objects occurred to
" him; the one to procure a repeal of the penal
" laws againſt Roman Catholics, and the other
" to bring about an Union with England; that
" both ſeemed viſionary, and yet he could not
" get them out of his head; that the deareſt
" friend he had in the world was Lord Harcourt,
" and that he would be obliged to me if I would
" go over to Ireland, let Lord Harcourt know the
" offer which he (Lord Rochford) had got, his
" heſitation, and his two views, and receive
" Lord Harcourt's opinions and reaſons upon
" thoſe views, which could be better done by
" converſation than by letters. When I delivered
" my letter to the Lord Lieutenant, he ſmiled,
" and ſaid, a Naſſau may do in this country
" what I cannot, and Rochford is open and frank,
" and will pleaſe the Iriſh; but what you came
" about requires much talking over.—I ſtaid a
" week with him in the country; with regard to
" the penal laws, he thought there was not much
" difficulty, that the Roman Catholics were all
" on the ſide of England, and of the King of

" England

" England, in the American war, and that very
" good uſe might be made of them in the courſe
" of it, and there are men now living, high both
" in church and ſtate, who may remember the
" converſations on that head, and that they
" thought as he did. But with regard to the
" other object, Lord Harcourt thought there
" were great difficulties, yet perhaps not
" unſurmountable.—When two men open their
" minds freely, and give their lights to each
" other in converſation, it is difficult to ſay on
" what ſide thoughts and opinions originate, and
" ſtill more difficult, at the diſtance of ten years,
" to recollect them. But the impreſſion of my
" mind at preſent of Lord Harcourt's opinion is,
" that to attempt an Union with Ireland in time
" of war was inſanity, notwithſtanding its having
" ſucceeded in Scotland at ſuch a time:—that
" the minds of the Iriſh muſt be long prepared,
" for which purpoſe Government ſhould take the
" aſſiſtance of the beſt writers of the nation on
" both ſides of the water, to point out the ad-
" vantages of the Union in different lights to
" different men, and ſhould, in the mean time,
" treat Ireland with a kindneſs and confidence
" which ſhe well deſerved; that no Union ſhould
" be attempted, unleſs the wiſh for it came from
" the ſide of Ireland, and even then unleſs there

" were

" were a ſufficient body of troops there to keep
" the madmen in order, and the troops Iriſh, and
" not Engliſh; that the two great objections to it
" were, loſs of money by the abſentees, and loſs
" of importance, by diminiſhing the number of
" peers and commoners, if a repreſentation ſhould
" take place to the united Parliament, as was
" done in Scotland: but there was a way to ob-
" viate both objections by one meaſure—The
" meaſure was, that the rights of the peers,
" counties, and boroughs of Ireland, ſhould con-
" tinue as they were, but that only one third, in
" rotation, ſhould attend the united Parliament,
" and he who did not chooſe to attend, ſhould
" have power to name one, from amongſt the other
" members, in his place, by which all the men
" of parts or fortune (the only perſons who ought
" to attend Parliament) would be almoſt always
" ſure of a ſeat, and the repreſentation of Ire-
" land would at that time have conſiſted of about
" 40 peers and about 100 commoners.

" When I reported theſe things to Lord Roch-
" ford, he ſaid, 'all this is too long an affair for
" me,' and declined the honour which his Sove-
" reign intended for him."

" Since that time the Duke of Richmond has
" thrown out an idea to the public, that the Parlia-
" ment of the three nations ſhould be held frequently

in

" in Dublin, by which I presume, his Grace meant " in regular succession of time, and only in time of " peace, because in time of war it would be impro- " per to remove Government from the vicinity of " intelligence.

" There is not only fairness to Ireland, but depth " of policy, because Government then knowing all " its subjects of condition, and all its subjects know- " ing each other, would be wound through and " round his Majesty's dominions.

" The ancient Greek Legislators who certainly " were the wisest that ever lived, because they made " politics in the abstract a science, saw well the con- " sequences of the chain, when under pretence of " contributing to the amusement of the people, they " assembled all Greece at regular times at the pub- " lic games.

" There are two objections to his Grace's plan ; " one is want of accommodation in Dublin for the " numerous English Members of the Legislature ; " the other, the fatigue of transporting themselves ; " but it would be better to lay out a million of mo- " ney in erecting houses in Dublin, to accommodate " the members of the Legislature, than to be laying " out one hundred, or perhaps two hundred mil- " lions, to conquer Ireland, or be conquered by her.

" And with respect to the important point of per- " sonal fatigue, Archibald, Duke of Argyle, who

lived

" lived to the age of near ninety, in the full enjoy-
" ment of health and faculties, uſed to ſay, that all
" the Peers of England, might do like him, if they
" would make a journey twice in the year of 500
" miles without ſtopping."

Three ſtrong obſervations, in my mind, flow from the exiſtence of the fact eſtabliſhed by this anecdote: Firſt, that the meaſure of an incorporating Union was conceived more than twenty-three years ago; ſecondly, that the idea firſt originated from the Crown or the Britiſh Cabinet;—and thirdly, that it was conſidered, even at that time, a point of great magnitude to Great Britain.

The details of this curious anecdote offer to the contemplative mind, many ſubjects of curious ſpeculation—The project was reckoned nothing leſs than viſionary!—The atchievement of it, the ground of great glory—And why? In the year 1776, the people of this country were poor and dependent; in the year 1776, the people of Great Britain were rich and powerful, and in compariſon with their preſent ſtate. unencumbered.—The Union, at that time, might have had the appearance at leaſt, of a boon offered by a magnanimous nation, to a diſtreſſed, wretched, and oppreſſed people.—Why then was it reckoned viſionary? Why was the atchievement of it an object of ſuch glory?

glory?—Becauſe even then, and for centuries preceding, a Britiſh Miniſter dared not attempt to awe us, becauſe even then, a Britiſh Miniſter little thought he could be able to cajole us.—Viſionary! I ſay, becauſe any project whether of terror, or of artifice, would have met its merited doom, in the ſpirit and underſtanding of the united people of Ireland.—But at that period and previous thereto, we could not be called a free people, therefore the Britiſh Miniſter might the more eaſily have carried the meaſure, if it had been a ſerious and important object to him; we were not in fact a free people—granted—But who dares to tell me, that the ſpirit of liberty was at any time annihilated in this land? It felt and moved not—it liſtened and ſpoke not—in its apparent ſilence and inaction, it retained the vital principles of ſpeech and motion.——Was it time that it ſhould ſpeak and move? Its voice was heard, and its motions were ſeen.—It deſcended from its obſcure retreat, it came forth from the ſmoaky hut of the impoveriſhed peaſant, with augmented glory and ſplendor—it traverſed the land, with the angelic motion and language of peace; it was ready to aſſume the tone and march of war;—it was willing to negotiate; it was ready to lead its warriors into the field of battle;—it wiſhed to remonſtrate; it was ready to aſſert.—The olive was

preferred, and in the year 1782, the freedom of Ireland was recorded.—The ſpirit that acquired, is able to maintain; the dæmon of diſcord has deformed its features; it has not altered its eſſence; it waits the attuned harmony of invocation, to liſten with joy and with effect, to deſcend once more into our plains, and re-aſſert our rights.—It wants but the co-operation of its own children, to make an object that was viſionary in 1776, impoſſible in 1799; to annihilate the project, or perpetuate its epithet.

In the enumeration of the difficulties attendant on a meaſure of ſuch magnitude to the empire, and ſuch danger to the common conſtitution, it is curious to obſerve, that not one word is mentioned, of any obſtruction the meaſure might receive, from the Britiſh Parliament or the Britiſh people. Nor is it leſs curious to note the different means, propoſed by different Stateſmen, to attain the ſame end.—In the year 1776, to attempt the Union in time of war was inſanity; in the year 1799, time of war, the very period fixed on by the Britiſh Miniſter;—in the year 1776, the minds of the Iriſh muſt be *long* prepared; in the year 1799, the Iriſh people taken by ſurprize;—in the year 1776, the beſt writers to be employed at both ſides of the water; in the year 1799, only one writer employed, and that a man deficient in ability, and of

known

known and tried profligacy of principle.—In the year 1776, the advantages of the Union were to be pointed out to different men in different lights. In the year 1799, not a ſingle advantage pointed out to any man, ſave the mournful pretext of burying a falſe and perſonal alarm in the ruins of the Conſtitution.—In the year 1776, Ireland was to be treated with kindneſs and confidence. In the year 1799, or rather previous thereto, (for I mean not to arraign the conduct of the preſent Viceroy) Ireland treated with harſhneſs and diſtruſt.—In the year 1776, no Union to be attempted unleſs the wiſh for it came from the ſide of Ireland. In the year 1799, not a ſingle ſuggeſtion to that effect, made by any, even the moſt contemptible body in the community.—The only point on which theſe different æras touch, is in the ſtrength of the troops, held neceſſary to carry the meaſure, and even here, there exiſts a difference of great conſequence and moment.—In the year 1776, the troops were to be Iriſh; in the year 1799, they are for the moſt part Britiſh.

Can any *Iriſhman* read this ſhort and ſimple abſtract, without emotions of horror and indignation? Is this devoted country to be the ſport of a Britiſh miniſter, through every modification of policy, and every gradation of crime? Have not 600

years been a ſufficient trial of our ſubmiſſion, our patience, our forbearance? Is year after year to roll over our heads, only for the purpoſe of making us ſubjects of experiment and objects of ambition? Are we to be connected with Great Britain, only through the medium of ſuch degradation and diſgrace? I have yet a confidence, that the attempt at our ruin may prove the working of our ſalvation.

With reſpect to the plans of repreſentation, ſuggeſted by Lord Harcourt, and the Duke of Richmond, I have nothing to do. The firſt ſeems vicious; the other is I am ſure chimerical. The firſt retains with numerous additions, &c. all the vices of the old ſyſtem. The principle of the latter, as far as it goes, ſeems fair, but the meaſure is abſolutely impracticable. If I am to be ſtript of the only guarantee of my liberty, (an independent legiſlature) I care not what the terms, or the plan may be. I would rather ſubmit to the uncontrouled conditions of a conqueror, than become a ſlave on terms of my own making. I would rather ſuffer by misfortune, than proſper by diſgrace. I would rather be the victim of power, than the ſlave of negociation. I may fall a ſacrifice to authority, I never ſhall be the ſuicide of my own rights. I may be taken captive in the field of battle, but I will not baſely ſurrender, without the honorable effort of a

ſtruggle.

ſtruggle. I had rather die a freeman, than live a ſlave.

I dwell the more on this anecdote, becauſe I feel that, in a ſmall compaſs, it furniſhes volumes of uſeful inſtruction, to the people of Ireland. It eſtabliſhes beyond the poſſibility of contradiction, a plan of operations, a ſyſtem of darkneſs and dexterity, to carry this meaſure. It eſtabliſhes beyond a doubt, the opinion then entertained, in the Britiſh cabinet, of the ſpirit and good ſenſe of the Iriſh nation, which would have made an encroachment on its then nominal conſtitution, a meaſure of certain difficulty and great danger. It deſtroys any argument built on the unforeſeen ſituation of public affairs. It accounts for a ſyſtem, to which our recent misfortunes are alone attributable.—This plan of Union might, with ſome induſtry, be traced much farther back, than the year 1776. I believe there are men now living, who well remember, that this very meaſure of an incorporating Union was a favourite object of the late Earl of Chatham, and that particlarly in the year 1763, he often mentioned it, as a matter of great benefit and importance to Great Britain *, and that he form-

* This anecdote I have from a gentleman, of much worth and reſpectability, who for many years had the honor of repreſenting in the Parliament of Ireland, an independent county.

ed

ed to himſelf the hope of carrying the meaſure, by means of the Catholics, and that his *avowed* object was an object of taxation. Yes! our country is to have the honor of being united, for ſo diſintereſted and beneficial a purpoſe—Taxation!—aye! there's the rub—aye! there's the ſimple ſolution of all this myſtery, this darkneſs, this ſilence, this cunning, this caution, this perſeverance, this treachery, this corruption, this coercion, this diſcord, this civil war, this rapine, this blood—yes!—Revenue!—That ſingle word loſt America—That ſingle word may loſe Ireland. What was the ſcheme of Lord North, at the commencement of the American war? diſunite the Colonies, (ſaid he) and they muſt become an eaſy conqueſt.—His meaſures however counteracted his principle—He gave the Americans a year's notice of the project of the Stamp Act. —The ſparks of diſcontent communicated to each other, and before the time expired, America was in a conflagration. What has been the conduct of the immaculate Miniſter, at the head of his Majeſty's councils? Diſunite the people of Ireland, and ſhe muſt fall, Great Britain muſt have her. In her ſtate of diviſion and weakneſs, preſent to her any meaſure even of deſtruction, and ſhe will accept it.—In the paroxyſm of her fever, ſhe will take poiſon for her medicine. Oh! wick-

ed

ed deteſtable policy! thou haſt but too well ſucceeded. Alas! we have been divided. God grant that in running from one another, we may not meet in the arms of our common murderer. No—my prophetic heart tells me, we ſhall not. My prophetic heart tells me, that I was not born to weep over the departed liberties of my country.

It is I think a matter of very curious obſervation, that this country ſhould have exiſted in a connexion with Great Britain, for ſix hundred and twenty-ſix years, and never ſhould have thought of a meaſure of ſo much utility and importance to it. It is ſtrange, that through every ſpecies of inſult, oppreſſion, and misfortune, it never ſhould have occurred to it, to raiſe itſelf into a ſituation of grandeur and opulence, by being a part of a great kingdom, in the full participation of all its advantages, whether political, conſtitutional, or commercial, and that too, at a time, when ſuch an Union might have been ſpecioufly ſtated, as one, with unincumbered growing riches and proſperity——Independent of the intrinſic merits or demerits of any meaſure, I think I am warranted in diſbelieving beneficial effects, when I am certain of corrupt and ſelfiſh motives. It is no difficult matter, to make any individual or any nation, ſenſible of its own intereſts;—it is

the

the topic of all others, which nations, as well as individuals, liſten to with the greateſt attention, and on which they are the more eaſily convinced. —The underſtanding, which on other occaſions is Boeotian, is Newtonian on this.—The feelings that ſeem annihilated to other purſuits, are quick and penetrating on this. In ſhort, I am very apt to doubt the wiſdom of a meaſure, that takes above ſix hundred years to diſcover; and ſure I am, that I ſhould ſuſpect the ſincerity of an offer, which it required great dexterity to manage.—Is it then in the nature of things, that caution and ſecreſy are ſo neceſſary to the adminiſtration of friendſhip? or that long and anxious ſolicitations and induſtry are to be employed to make men accept a kindneſs? That much ability is to be exerted to make men underſtand, and much influence uſed to make men act up to their real intereſts.—Either this propoſition is the reſult of diſintereſted friendſhip, or it is not.—If it is, then why employ all the artifices of refined policy, to make us underſtand, and feel it in that light. If it is not, then, I ſay it ſhould in *limine* be ſcouted, with heavy execrations on the villain's head, that could aſſume the tone of protection, for the purpoſe of oppreſſion, that could put on the ſacred garb of friendſhip, for the purpoſe of making a victim inſtead of a friend.

How

How often have we aſked each other, in the courſe of the laſt three years, what object the Britiſh miniſter could have had, in ſcattering Britiſh troops over the ſurface of our territory. How often have we aſked each other, if the Britiſh miniſter could entertain a project of wreſting from us our conſtitution. How often have we communicated to each other, our jealouſies, our ſuſpicions, our alarms. How often have I myſelf told many of you in converſation, that the Britiſh miniſter never would be ſatisfied, until he dragooned you into this very meaſure. How often have your friends told you, that your unhappy diſſenſions, and religious feuds, were not the workings of your own natures or your own hearts; but were the wicked contrivances, of a narrow, intereſted, and vindictive policy. How often are you to be told, that the miniſter (whom his friends dignify with the epithet of unbending) could never forget, or forgive, your high ſpirited conduct on the propoſitions. Do you think he has forgot your conduct on the regency? Are you ſtill incredulous? Are you ſtill to enquire, why 40,000 Britiſh ſoldiers, in Britiſh pay have been at different times, and under different pretexts, poured into the fair boſom of your country? Look to the language of Lord Harcourt in the year 1776, his private, confidential, myſterious,

conſpiracy language.—No—ſays he, it would be inſanity to attempt the meaſure, *without a ſufficient body of troops.* Look to the conduct of the Britiſh miniſter in 1799. Aſk yourſelves are theſe things well intended? Aſk yourſelves, was it well done to ſeduce ſome, to frighten others, into a ſtate of reciprocal rancour and animoſity? Believe me, it could only be for the purpoſe of making you the eaſy victims of premeditated cunning, or preconcerted violence. If Britiſh troops be neceſſary for us, it is only for protection and not oppreſſion. Let us recover from our fright, let us breath from our misfortunes, and if in the moment of cool deliberative judgment, this meaſure ſhall appear for our advantage, let us in God's name embrace it.—But no—the Britiſh miniſter is impatient; he is afraid to riſque the verdict of your judgments; he is much better ſatisfied, with the reſult of your fears and your calamities.—He knows he has no other ground to ſtand on—take from him the bayonet, and our own alarms, and his ſyſtem crumbles into duſt.

With what truth and eloquence have I myſelf heard this man declaim, in the Britiſh Senate, againſt the encroachments of the Great Nation (as they impiouſly call themſelves) on their innocent unoffending neighbours, when he himſelf was conſcious, that at that very moment, his helliſh

agents

agents were at work, to undermine the liberties of Ireland. With what effrontery can he or men, brand any nation with the epithets of wanton hostility, and treacherous friendship, he, I say, who has by the artifices of a mean and wicked policy, worked us to the brink of the precipice, and who having got us there, would with unrelenting unrepining tyranny commit us to our destruction. The farther removed that any Acts of Parliament are, from even the appearance of a military force, the more are they consistent with the genuine principles of a free constitution. But when it is a question of our existence as a nation, who is it that will say, that time of war, time of public calamity, time of fright and alarm, should be the season fixed for its discussion. Who is it that will not say, that on so tremendous a question as this, the decision should not only be, but should appear to be, extricated from every suspicion of force and violence. Look to your own written and unwritten laws, and see whether I am not right. As the friend, the decided friend of the monarchy, I caution ministers against the enaction of a measure, in such troubled times, and under such suspicious and portentous circumstances. Let me tell them that in a country like this, a vital, or rather a deadly act, passed in the middle of war, in the centre of a tremendous military

force, under the influence of immediate perſonal danger, cannot be reckoned ſalutary in its nature, or permanent in its duration.—Let me tell them in the language of an immortal man, that in a country like this, there are no laws that are fit for our Legiſlature to give, or our people to receive, but the "unarmed laws of a free people."

Many more, and perhaps important obſervations, ſuggeſt themſelves to me, on the different topics of this anecdote.—I might ſay much with reſpect to the Catholic claim; I might plead their uniform and unſhaken loyalty, in this anecdote ſtrongly noticed, through the moſt trying, afflicting, and heart-breaking circumſtances, as good grounds for the further emancipation of that body. I might dwell at ſome length, on that part of the anecdote, which recommends the troops to be employed for the purpoſe of carrying this meaſure (for you have ſeen that troops were conſidered a *ſine qua non* of its accompliſhment) to be Iriſh and not Engliſh.—I might ſuſpect the goodneſs of a cauſe, which by the confeſſion of the Men in Power, demanded the aſſiſtance of the ableſt writers in both countries.—I might dwell with ſome effect upon the term *madmen* uſed in this anecdote—I might with good reaſon aſk who are meant by that deſignation—I might enquire if rebellion was either brooding or afloat in 1776—I

might

might remind you that the aſſociated ſocieties of United Iriſhmen are of many years later growth—I might without much exaggeration hint to you, who thoſe madmen were—I might without overleaping the bounds of belief, tell you that thoſe madmen were you—yes—the people of Ireland. In ſhort, there is not a topic, in this curious and intereſting anecdote, that would not furniſh materials for a volume. Let the people of Ireland think on them, and they will not think in vain.

With what little reaſon, the Union of Scotland is mentioned as an argument for ſuch a meaſure in this country, may be eaſily ſeen by examining that meaſure with a little attention. In order to make analogy a ground of probability, it ſhould appear, that there exiſted a ſimilarity of pre-exiſting circumſtances, as alſo a probability at leaſt of ſimilar effects from ſimilar cauſes.—It ſhould appear, that certain effects have happened, and that they neceſſarily reſulted from the ſtated cauſes.—With reſpect to the ſimilarity of pre-exiſting circumſtances, I maintain it, that there never were two countries more differently ſituated, than were Scotland in the year 1706, and Ireland in the year 1799.—The population of Scotland was about that time 1,700,000—I admit De Foe makes it about two millions, but Templeton and Brakenridge make 1,500,000, ſo that perhaps the truth

truth lay between.—The population of England was about 6,500,000.—The Scotch had no trade whatever, nor any manufactures.—Their conſtant warfare with ſo thin a population, diverted their thoughts from agriculture.—Their conſtitution and laws were not the admiration of the world. Their ſituation neceſſarily expoſed them to the inroads of their intereſted ambitious neighbours; and yet with all theſe diſadvantages, every effort at an Union, from the reign of Edward the Firſt, until its accompliſhment in 1707, proved ineffectual; nor would it then have been carried, had not the Union of the two Crowns given a more eaſy and conſtitutional acceſs to the meaſure, than former times afforded.—Add to this brief ſtatement what appears to me to be the greateſt ingredient in the conſideration of this queſtion, viz. the amount of the national debt of England, which was at the commencement of the negotiations for an Union, upon a rough calculation that I have made, about 20 millions; for on the 31ſt December 1701, the national debt amounted only to 16,394,701l. 1s. 7¼d.

Let us now ſee, what is the ſituation of Ireland in the year 1799.—Its population is five millions; its commerce extenſive, incredibly ſo, conſidering the date of its emancipation.—I go farther, I ſay it is as great as it ought to be, conſiſtent with its

true

true intereſts; of that by and by; its manufactures not inconſiderable; its linen manufacture magnificent; its territory ſo highly improved, that it not only ſupplies its own inhabitants, but ſends its ſupplies to the Britiſh markets, and actually gives them ſubſiſtence for three months in the year.—(I do not, however, mean to ſay that on this ſubject much is not yet to be done)—Our conſtitution and laws the ſame as thoſe of England.—The interpoſition of the ſea, a barrier of defence, if ſuch were neceſſary—a connexion with Great Britain, of the trueſt and moſt permanent nature—a connexion of common intereſts—an uninterrupted harmony—a willingneſs to enter into the views of Great Britain, and an eagerneſs to ſupport them to the beſt of our abilities,—and laſtly, the debt of Ireland 12 millions—the debt of Great Britain 500,000,000.

Let any man read with attention the hiſtory of the firſt years of this century, and I am certain he will feel, that the Union with Scotland, ſupported by the ableſt writers and ſtateſmen, was the ſubſtitute for extermination.—Let me give here the words of one of the advocates for the Union in Scotland—"Let (ſays De Foe) thoſe who oppoſe "the Union, and ſtill refuſe to own the advan- "tages of it, look back upon the years of blood, "and the terrible devaſtations theſe two ſiſter nations

"nations ſuffered, in the days of their ſeparation; "let them examine the hiſtory of the paſt ages, let "them enquire there for the particulars of 314 "battles, and calculate the blood of a million "of the braveſt men in Europe, loſt in the ſenſe- "leſs feuds of theſe two nations; let them view "the ſpoils of the borders not yet repaired, the "monuments of the nobility ſlain in the field, "which yet remain; let them viſit the ruined "caſtles, the demoliſhed fortifications, the de- "populated towns, the gentlemens ſeats left in "heaps which yet appear"—All theſe, ſays he, "more than compenſate for the *diſadvantages* of "the Union."—And indeed, there was ſome wiſ- dom and much of humanity in the thought—But is there any-man who can be hardy enough to aſ- ſert, that there is one ſingle circumſtance of pre- exiſting ſimilarity, which might have made an Union neceſſary for Scotland in 1705-6, that can make it expedient for Ireland in the year 1799?— So much for pre-exiſting circumſtances.

I ſhould little think of carrying the arguments of the ſuppoſed analogy farther, but that I find much ſtreſs is laid on it by all the advocates for an Union.—They trumpet forth the mighty advan- tages of the Union to Scotland, they aſcribe its ſituation as a ſituation of unexampled proſperity and grandeur, and this they wholly aſcribe to the meaſure

measure of an incorporating Union.—They tell you of the high price of land in Scotland, and they make that a circumstance on which the nation's prosperity and welfare is clearly ascertained.

I am one of those who on great political or constitutional questions, cannot give credit to the bare assertions of any man, much less of him who finds it his interest, and makes it his employment, to misrepresent any thing, and every thing for the worst purposes.—I have endeavoured both by sending and personal enquiry, to make myself acquainted with the situation of Scotland, and I find it such, as belies the statement made by the advocates of an Union. If I wished to be ascertained of the prosperity and welfare of any nation, I should look to those grand cardinal points on which essentially depend the happiness of any people, and by which alone—that happiness can be ascertained.—What is the reason that, with rather a more extensive territory than Ireland, the population of Scotland has scarcely increased since the Union?—The statistical survey does not make it exceed 1,700,000.—What is the reason that its fisheries have been so grossly neglected *?—What is the reason that its

E

* In the northern counties and islands of Scotland are reckoned 4,528,000 acres, and the population in 1795 was computed to be

its commerce, which is of ninety-two years ſtanding is inſignificant, when compared with the commerce of this country, which is not more than nineteen years old?—What is the reaſon, that its inhabitants are found to fill a great proportion of the ranks of Great Britain, and that ſome of its ableſt inhabitants are the great captains of foreign States?—What is the reaſon that in points of civil liberty it is a country to be mentioned only with ſorrow?—Alas! the want of a local ſuperintending legiſlature (the only real nurſery of a free State,)—the only durable ſource of glory and proſperity to any country;—that excluſive guardianſhip, and management of the rights, intereſts, and welfare of a free people,—

be 137,754 ſouls, which is near 38 acres to each individual, or about 20 ſouls to a ſquare mile. In the kingdom of Naples the general population is reckoned to give 303 ſouls to a ſquare mile, ſupported by the fertility of the territory. The land in the northern part of Scotland is greatly inferior to that of the kingdom of Naples in point of fertility; but this inferiority is fully compenſated by the ſuperior fertility of the ſeas in furniſhing ſubſiſtence to man; therefore the improvement of the fiſheries by the eſtabliſhment of large maritime towns may render the lands in thoſe parts of the iſland capable of ſupporting a population equal to that of the kingdom of Naples, that is, would increaſe the number of their inhabitants to near a million and an half, and the value of the lands in a proportionable degree.——*Eſſential Wealth of Nations.*

for

for I ſay it is impoſſible that an Imperial Legiſlature can be the beſt judge, or the moſt ſanguine promoter, of local intereſts and concerns.—I forbear to ſtate the various encroachments, that have been ſo notoriouſly made upon the articles of the Union.—Let me however mention here two facts, which I have from a gentleman of extenſive information, and undoubted veracity.—If I am wrong in the ſtatement, let me be contradicted, and I undertake to prove it. About nine or ten years ago, the diſtillers of Edinburgh entered into an agreement with the preſent Britiſh miniſter, that they ſhould be exciſed in proportion to the ſize of the veſſels.—This branch of manufacture they carried on with ſuch ſpirit and ſucceſs, as to awaken the jealouſy of their Engliſh neighbours.—The latter remonſtrated with Mr. Pitt.—Their remonſtrances had their due effect, and the diſtilleries of Edinburgh have fallen to nothing.—Again.—Magneſia is made, or may be made, of the refuſe of the ſalt-works. The Scotch manufacturers were able, by their induſtry and ſpirit, to underſell the Engliſh manufacturers. Theſe latter got alarmed. The ſame kind of remonſtrance to the ſame Mr. Pitt.—General directions were given, to put a ſtop to this manufacture on any plauſible grounds;

the old and obſolete law books were ſearched—an old ſtatute, prohibiting the ſale of bittern out of the ſalt veſſels, was found, inſiſted on, and the manufacture periſhed. Add to all theſe, the preſent ſtate of civil liberty in Scotland—not more than 2000 voters in all Scotland, and half of theſe nominal ſuperiorities—*i. e.* having a right to vote without any property whatever, a kind of incorporeal hereditament, the miſchievous and abominable privileges of the Royal Boroughs, for the oppreſſion of the people in their vicinage.—All, all theſe I ſay, have convinced my poor underſtanding that however the Union of Scotland might have been neceſſary at the time, Scotland has no reaſon to boaſt of any ſolid national advantages neceſſarily derived from it. I admit that there is no part of the world where lands ſell ſo high as in Scotland. I know eſtates ſometimes ſell for forty years purchaſe—but this inſtead of cauſe of exultation, is in my mind, a ſymptom of national calamity. The price of land in any country, depends on the quantity of lands and money at the market. In all great commercial countries, there is always an extenſive and rapid transfer of territorial property. In Scotland the quantity of land at the market is very trifling, whilſt the quantity of money of *individuals*, who have made fortunes,

not

not in Scotland, but particularly in the East Indies, together with a moſt amiable attachment, that to this day a Scotchman feels for his country, tend to raiſe the price of land in that country, greatly beyond its intrinſic value.

Although the legiſlatures of Scotland and England have been incorporated, yet I deny that it has followed from thence that England and Scotland have been incorporated,—ſuch an effect can never be the work of man. To produce ſuch an effect, both nations ſhould have been melted down and reformed, and regenerated, and reſhaped into a common empire, with common intereſts, common objects, and common affections. Why are Engliſh and Scotch animoſities proverbial unto this hour?—Why do the Engliſh theatres teem with ridicule and ſeverity on this (I ſhall call them) brave, generous, enlightened, hoſpitable, feeling people? Theſe are facts not to be denied. An Act of Parliament, to which God's attribute has been moſt impiouſly applied, has not been able to extinguiſh long habits, laſting animoſities, mortal antipathies, and ſturdy and inveterate prejudices. The great misfortune of Scotland, I ſay, is, that it has been an added, and never has been an incorporated country. When countries have been long ſeparated,

and

and have for centuries on centuries, entertained reciprocal notions of jealousy and animosity, bitter national animosity;—it is in vain for an Act of Parliament to attempt what only can be accomplished by an Act of God;—it is in vain to resort to the dictates of political wisdom, or the mystery of political witchcraft, to stop or alter the rapid current of nature;—to attempt to modify by Acts of Parliament, the qualities of the human heart;—to take exact measure of the operations of the human understanding. I know of no crucible in nature, I know of none in politics, into which you can throw the incongruous particles of national ideas and affections, and melt and flux them into a common shape, into a beautiful system of harmony in all parts. Hence then, even here, and in this view of the subject, does there to my humble judgment appear a strong objection to a legislative, but not *incorporating*, Union of this country with Great Britain.

Having endeavoured to destroy any argument built on a supposed analogy of circumstances, causes, and effects—Let me now consider the question on its own merits or demerits.—And first, I hold it to be a principle never denied in politics, existing in the physical and moral world, that a change in any condition, which change is the result of volition and design, should come recommended

mended by the following grand leading principle. The thing for which it is changed, ſhould appear inconteſtably better than the thing changed; and in the conſideration of this, the judicious ſtateſman muſt be ever guided by the following mode of reaſoning: 1ſt, it muſt appear that the advantages from the change are morally certain; 2dly, that they are ſo important in their nature, that they countervail the diſadvantage of recurring to a change; (an aptitude to which, is in polities particularly to be avoided)—thirdly, that the ſame or greater advantages cannot be attained without *ſuch* a change, becauſe in the ſcience of politics, all experiments ſhould at firſt be made in *corpore vili*, and if found inadequate, then, and then only, is a fundamental change warranted;—and fourthly, that the advantages reſulting from ſuch a change, are not only certain in their operation, but permanent in their duration.—By the word change, I would be underſtood to mean a change by which the eſſence of any thing is altered.—And in the inveſtigation of theſe propoſitions, I lay this down as a principle not to be departed from; that the *onus probandi* lies on the advocates for ſuch a change, becauſe it is certainly more incumbent to prove the badneſs of an inſtitution for its deſtruction, than its goodneſs for its preſervation.

tion and continuance.—Were the queſtion to reſt on this ſtatement, it would be only for the Britiſh Miniſter to ſpeak, and the Iriſh people to liſten, and the deciſion on the point, would litterally be on the day of judgement. As I have however mentioned, that Ireland can only be loſt by Ireland, as we have woeful reaſon to believe, that the ſyſtem of the Britiſh Miniſter has made no inconſiderable progreſs among us, as we have alſo grounds for ſuppoſing, that his meaſure will preſent itſelf to the public, in all the ſpecious finery of dreſs—And as there may be among us ſome, who will not be ſatisfied with negative proof, I think it not inexpedient to deſcend for a while from the vantage ground, and I hope to be able to prove, that no ſpecific plan of Union that can be deviſed, will be immediately or ultimately beneficial to this country.

As no particular plan has been as yet ſubmitted to you, it is impoſſible to be aſcertained of the exact ratio of its diſadvantages; but I think that in any ſtage of this queſtion, I am warranted in laying it down as a fixed and certain principle, that any plan whatever, formed in the Britiſh Cabinet, unſolicited by the Iriſh nation, and managed, and to be accompliſhed, in the manner I have already mentioned, muſt contain in itſelf

ſomething, which under all its circumſtances, is calculated to be beneficial to Great Britain.—I am alſo ready to ſuppoſe, that for this *real* advantage to be gained by Great Britain, the Britiſh Miniſter will endeavour to put forward many ſpecious grounds of temptation to the Iriſh nation.—If I am right in my principle, the next conſideration is this—If Great Britain is to gain, how and in what manner is ſuch an advantage to be acquired, and next we are to conſider this propoſition—Is Ireland likely to loſe in the point or points on which Great Britain is to gain?—And if ſo, is Ireland likely to be indemnified for ſuch actual loſs, in any other and what points?—To enable us to examine theſe propoſitions with effect, we muſt reſort to thoſe grand cardinal points on which the proſperity or decline of any nation can be aſcertained; and I conceive that thoſe are:—firſt, its natural poſition—ſecondly, its natural produce—thirdly, its population—fourthly, its agriculture—fifthly, its commerce—ſixthly, its manufactures—ſeventhly, its conſtitution and laws; and laſtly, its revenue and debt. Now, I admit, for the ſake of argument, that Great Britain will not be likely to gain in any point, ſave the laſt—in other words, ſave an addition of revenue and diminution of its debt.—It may be ſaid theſe points may be guarded

by the *terms*—Then if it is not meant that Great Britain ſhould gain on any point, why agitate the queſtion at all—but this is abſurd—I have already ſhewn that this meaſure is of long ſtanding; that hitherto it was not dreamt of by the Iriſh nation, and it neceſſarily follows that it is conſidered that Great Britain muſt gain, and therefore previous terms acting againſt a manifeſt principle, are but a wretched flimſy ſecurity.—Let us now ſee how Ireland is to be compenſated for yielding a proportionable revenue, or bearing any proportion of Great Britain's debts.—With reſpect to the two firſt points, I imagine no courtier will be hardy enough to aſſert, that an Union will change our geographical poſition, or alter the nature of our ſoil—If ſuch even could be the caſe, the alteration would be moſt likely for the worſe; and here let me take occaſion to ſay, that I conſider the poſition of Ireland and its natural ſoil, ſuperior to the poſition and ſoil of England—We come now to the third point, viz. population—And here I ſhall ſtate that which can be collected from the moſt authentic documents.——The population of Great Britain does not amount to ten millions; that of Ireland is at leaſt five millions.—So far back as the year 1788, on a ſurvey made by the hearth-money collectors, the population of Ireland

land exceeded 4,500,000; and that eſtimate proceeded on a calculation of 6¼ to one houſe—I believe that computation has been reckoned under the truth; however, it is immaterial, as it appears that eleven years ago, the population of Ireland exceeded 4,500,000.—Is Ireland likely to benefit in this point by an Union with Great Britain?—The population of any country can only be encreaſed by emigrations from other countries, or improvements within itſelf—As to emigrations from Great Britain, I hold it the height of abſurdity to ſuppoſe it, and even if it were to happen, the cauſe that contributed to it, muſt operate as a principle, and not as an expedient, and as a principle, it might operate to a great extent, which would ultimately prove the ruin of Great Britain, the population of which, at preſent, is ſo far below the proportionate population of Ireland. On the other hand, ſome emigration from Ireland there muſt be, from the meaſure itſelf, and ſure I am, if I can be warranted in arguing this part of the queſtion from a ſimilarity of feelings, the emigration muſt be conſiderable indeed. With reſpect to the ſecond general ſource of population, I take it there is no part of the œconomy of a free ſtate that ſo much requires the aid of a local ſuperintending Legiſlature as this very point. It has been invariably laid down, in all writers

on political œconomy, that no ſource of national wealth requires ſo much the foſtering hand of local legiſlation as this:—At all events no one will ſay that on this head, the ſituation of Ireland can be *improved* by an imperial Parliament.—The encouragement neceſſary to be given to agriculture of every deſcription—the neceſſity or expediency in an infant ſtate of giving drawbacks and bounties, and taking them off, as the caſe may require;—the improvement of that inexhauſtible ſource of wealth and population, the fiſheries—the plans for erecting villages on the ſea coaſts, as well for theſe fiſheries as for other purpoſes—all theſe depending on local circumſtances, tending to give local knowledge to the local enquirer; and laſtly, that provident care of the purſe of the nation, which ought never to ſuffer it to be plunged over head and ears in debt, and by increaſing the difficulty of living, leſſen the ſources of population.——It is to be remarked, that the population of Great Britain has riſen in no great degree theſe laſt fifty years, while within the laſt twenty-five years, the population of Ireland has increaſed at leaſt one-third. This however is very eaſily accounted for---The immenſe debt of Great Britain, of courſe its heavy taxes on every article of life, whilſt it diſcourages emigration from foreign countries

tries into it, tends alſo to increaſe a ſtate of celibacy; and it has therefore been with much truth remarked, that it has been wonderful that the population of Great Britain has been even ſtationary for ſo many years. I own I do foreſee that the population of Ireland, if there be an Union, will not increaſe at the end of twenty years, but will conſiderably diminiſh, and without it I am ſure it will be conſiderably augmented.

I come now to the fourth point, viz. agriculture, which I have ever conſidered the ſolid, viſible, angible, permanent wealth of any nation. How is Ireland likely to be benefited by Great Britain on this head?---Not by the emigration of the Britiſh farmers, of Britiſh ſkill and capital in this line, for in the catalogue of advantages held out by the advocates for this meaſure, this very article of agriculture, the moſt material of all, has been wholly omitted, either by miſtake, or deſign; indeed, the ſituation of many parts of Great Britain for want of agriculture would point thoſe parts out to the wiſe Stateſman, as fitter and more certain ſources of wealth created, than uncertain ſpeculations of wealth improved. The agriculture of this country has ariſen within the memory of a ſhort life to ſuch a ſtate of comfortable, I might ſay glowing proſperity, that one naturally

might

might aſk to what cauſe or cauſes is or are ſuch mighty effects attributable—The anſwer is ſhort —to your Parliament—to thoſe judicious encouragements and regulations which have been the reſult of an excellent natural underſtanding, improved, highly improved by an accurate local knowledge of your country.—Look to your corn laws, and you will ſcarcely venture on this head to entruſt your concerns to imperial legiſlation.—Since I have mentioned your corn laws, let me alſo ſay, that it is by a moſt honorable aſſociation of ideas, I caſt my eyes upon a gentleman to whoſe exertions, knowledge, and induſtry, the farming intereſts of Ireland are much indebted. It is with no ſmall degree of ſatisfaction I have learned, that he is ſtill attached to your intereſts. I hope the inhabitants of Cork may liſten to his opinions.—As to the fifth point, commerce—If England is to gain in point of revenue and in diminution of its national debt, what has it to give in exchange for theſe, on the ground of commerce—The commerce of any country can be benefited only by its extenſion and protection—and firſt as to extenſion. This can only be effected by the terms of the meaſure *expreſsly*, or by the neceſſary or probable conſequences of the meaſure;—and as to the terms of the meaſure, what can England expreſsly give to

Ireland

Ireland on that head?—Secondly, is what ſhe can give, an equivalent? In the firſt place, ſhe cannot *expreſsly* concede at this hour to Ireland, what Ireland claims of right for itſelf—the liberty of trading to every part of the world,—ſave and except to Great Britain.—A very narrow and ſhort-ſighted policy, in my humble opinion, prevents open ports between the two countries. By the Union this reſtriction will be done away; that is, the channel trade alone is the only *expreſs* commercial advantage to be given to Ireland, for an increaſe of revenue to Great Britain, and perhaps a diminution of its debt.—You will carry with you, that in arguing theſe ſeveral queſtions, I have only waived for a time, my privilege of affixing incalculable value to our conſtitution, which with my conſent never can be a purchaſeable commodity.

Let us ſee what this wonderful advantage of open markets is,—I am ſpeaking here of commerce, I ſhall ſpeak preſently of our manufactures—Well, the Britiſh ports are to be thrown open to us. The firſt queſtion to be aſked is, on what articles can the Iriſh merchants take advantage of this conceſſion.—Our commerce, *i. e.* the articles of our commerce I mean, is either domeſtic or foreign, either the produce of our own country,

or

or of foreign countries, I am ſpeaking here of the raw materials,—with reſpect to them, the Britiſh ports are open to us already; and I rather think that Great Britain never will be ſilly enough to ſhut them againſt us; for it is not likely that Great Britain will either wiſh to ſtarve or put herſelf on ſhort allowance, in order to hurt our commerce. The Britiſh people not having corn enough in their own country, muſt be ſupplied from ſome other country; and if Ireland can ſupply her on better terms than any other country, ſurely ſhe will not be weak enough to refuſe ſuch ſupply; and if ſhe were, Ireland would find markets enough elſewhere. Corn and the other articles of ſubſiſtence never want markets, they are of all articles the ſureſt ſource of public wealth, —as long as we have corn to ſell, ſo long there will not be wanting purchaſers. Now with reſpect to foreign and plantation produce, our ſhips freighted with that produce can go direct into the Britiſh ports, and ſurely this advantage (if it be one) we are not likely to loſe, for the beſt of all poſſible reaſons; that it is the intereſt of Great Britain we ſhould not. If the markets of Great Britain be under-ſtocked in theſe articles, theſe raw materials, ſurely it is her intereſt to be ſupplied by our overplus—and circumſtanced as

we

we are we can ſupply her on the eaſieſt terms; beſides it is to be conſidered, that independent of the advantages to Great Britain from this occaſional ſupply, the Britiſh merchants muſt gain ſomething, ſuch as ſtorage, brokeridge, commiſſion, &c. given by the Iriſh to the Britiſh merchant. So that on this part of the caſe I hold it impoſſible for Great Britain to give *expreſsly* any thing to Ireland, for the beſt of all human reaſons, having nothing to give. This brings me to the ſecond ſuppoſed ground of advantage to our commerce, *i. e.* the *neceſſary* or probable conſequences of the meaſure.

As on this head I cannot conceive, that the commerce of Ireland can be benefited but by the emigration of capital and population, I think I may with ſafety aſſert, that no *neceſſary* beneficial conſequence to Ireland can follow from the Union. Then as to the probable one—In the firſt place, I think it unlikely that ſuch a conſequence ſhould follow, and if it did, I ſhould think it foreboded the ruin of the Britiſh Nation. That it will not follow I think I am warranted in ſaying, not only on the ground of future probability, but paſt analogy—I am very certain that theſe very effects were predicted both in and out of Parliament, at the time of our obtaining a free trade and a free

conſtitution; and certainly neither the hopes of the Iriſh, nor the fears of the Engliſh Patriot have been realized. With reſpect to the *probable* effect ariſing from cheapneſs of labor and proviſions—I cannot well reckon on it. Sure I am that very few men will leave a ſucceſsful career of commerce, in a country in which they have lived, and to which they are attached, on the ſpeculation of a more ſucceſsful career in another country. And indeed, if ſuch were the caſe, the effect produced would after a little time, deſtroy the cauſe or temptation. I have ſaid that, if we could gain in point of commerce, by opening the Britiſh markets, ſuch gain would prove the ruin of Great Britain—I ſhall conſider this ſubject under the head of manufactures, to which I think it more properly belongs, and of which I am now going to ſpeak.

I have endeavoured to ſhew in a brief manner, how impoſſible it is for Ireland to benefit by the Union on the ground of commerce. I ſhall now proceed to conſider its intereſts, as likely to be affected by this meaſure on the ſcore of manufactures. The argument held out to Ireland is, that its manufactures will be greatly extended by the following means,—by having more markets,—by the infuſion of Britiſh abiſity and enterprize,

prize, and Britiſh capital. I confeſs I am one of thoſe who cannot give to manufactures, the weight given to them by ſome political writers; and ſure I am that the reſult of my enquiries on this ſubject is, that any endeavours to *force* them in an infant ſtate, is deſtructive to the higheſt degree;—therefore it is on the firmeſt conviction, and after the moſt mature deliberation, that I agree with Mr. Jefferſon, of Virginia, when he ſtates, that "'tis for the intereſt of the American States, that for a long time to come, her manufacturers ſhould reſide in Europe."—Nor is it without good reaſon and effect that I admire the policy of the United States. The increaſe of population in the American States from 1790 to 1794, is found by a late cenſus to be 1,321,364 perſons. They have wiſely avoided recurring to any means by which a revenue might be transferred, or individuals become rich; they have found that the true ſource of national wealth, the true ſource of population, is in the ability of the cultivator exerciſed in the fertility of the ſoil. Not ſo with Great Britain, ſhe has been an adult State a prodigious number of years; her admirers think ſhe has not grown old—certainly her age is not gradual in appearance. God forbid, ſhe ſhould experience the fate of a ſudden death! What therefore it becomes expedient

for Great Britain to recur to, for the purpoſe of creating a revenue would be ruin to a country not circumſtanced as is Great Britain. The expenditure of Great Britain the laſt year, is between fifty and ſixty millions of money—The whole amount of the rent of England is not more than twenty-two millions.

The whole rent of Great Britain is not able to pay within three millions, the intereſt of the national debt—In ſuch a ſituation it is neceſſary for Great Britain to have recourſe to extraordinary means of ſupply—ſhe muſt otherwiſe become bankrupt;—if her debt were not ſo enormous, ſure I am that ſhe would much more benefit by attending leſs to manufactures, and more to agriculture—And ſure I am alſo that by the judicious management of her waſte lands, ſhe would create a greater, more permanent, and more uſeful revenue, than by the moſt ſanguine ſucceſs from her manufacturing ſyſtem. The unencloſed commons and waſte lands of Great Britain, capable of cultivation, are ſuppoſed to be twenty-two millions of acres—I have made theſe obſervations for the purpoſe of ſhewing that, even ſuppoſing the advocates for a Union right in their poſitions, yet the thing to be gained is not in the preſent ſtate of Ireland worth gaining, and that there are other means by which an infant ſtate can gain more eſſentially, than by

the moſt natural and gradual encouragement of manufactures.

As, however, on this point I am well aware there may be differences of opinion—let me be permitted to conſider the queſtion on thoſe grounds thro' which it is preſented to the public mind—and firſt manufactures are either for home or *foreign* conſumption.—Now let us ſee how our manufactures will be advanced on theſe grounds by an Union—The greater the market, ſay the advocates for an Union, the greater the ſale—Firſt, I deny this as applicable to Ireland, and if it were, it muſt be ruin to Great Britain—It is I believe very notorious that with all our advantages of cheapneſs of labour, houſe rent, proviſions, &c. without the expence of freight, inſurance, &c. the Britiſh manufactures are able to underſell us even in our own markets. As to any hope of our being able to underſell the Britiſh manufacturer in his own market, it is the height of chimera—I think I may quote here the words of the preſent Chancellor of Ireland, in the debate on the propoſitions: "As to the liberty of ſending our manufactures to the Britiſh markets, I freely own I have not very ſanguine expectations of advantage from it."—If this effect will not follow, then the argument founded on open markets falls to the ground—And now I am to conſider the two other grounds:—emigration

tion of Britiſh ſkill and Britiſh capital, on which as to the probability of the effect, I have already ſaid ſomething in the preceding pages wherein I treated of commerce—I do maintain it, that when the ſame ſkill and capital are employed in different countries; but where the price of labour, houſe-rent, proviſions, &c. are leſs in one than in the other, the transfer of that ſkill and that capital can only be for the purpoſe of underſelling the manufacturer of that country wherein ſuch things are dearer; if it were otherwiſe it would be nonſenſe—And if the Britiſh merchant or manufacturer are ever underſold in the foreign markets, much leſs in their own, national bankruptcy muſt follow. Now to put the caſe to the common underſtanding of men, in the ſimpleſt way my poor abilities can comprehend—Either the Iriſh merchant or manufacturer will be able to underſell the Britiſh merchant or manufacturer, or he will not—Is that plain—Well, if he be not able to underſell him, what advantage on theſe heads will the Iriſhman gain by the Union? If he be able to underſell him, then what are to become of the commerce and manufactures of Great Britain?—Surely nobody will be ſo idiotic, as to ſuppoſe that foreign nations will continue to purchaſe from Great Britain, thoſe very commodities with which Ireland could ſupply them, on ſo much more ad-

vantageous

vantageous terms. I do moſt roundly aſſert, that Great Britain is ſo circumſtanced, as not to be able to afford to ſhare with Ireland the ſlighteſt portion of her commercial and manufactural monopoly; ſhe never can afford it, ſhe may make bargains with Ireland, but it is impoſſible that ſhe ever can propoſe a bargain to Ireland, in which ſhe will not hope to gain. I forbear to mention (as I had intended) the ſchedule of thoſe articles, on which there are prohibitory duties in the Britiſh ports. They are given in the 5th number of the Anti-Union, wherein thoſe queſtions of commerce and manufactures, are moſt ſenſibly and judiciouſly conſidered.

As more immediately connected with the topic of commerce, I ſhould have conſidered the carrying trade, a participation in which is held out to Ireland, as a very ſerious advantage to be gained by the Union. Now on this head, give me leave to ſay, that I think we cannot get this trade—I go farther, if we could get it, I maintain it, it would not be for the intereſt of this country (which I beg of you to have in your recollection, I have through the courſe of my argument conſidered as an infant ſtate) to accept it. It is a trade that employs a great number of hands, and a very great capital; but if you will look to the hiſtory of the world, you will not find it poſſeſſed by any nation,

tion, whoſe territory yielded them the common neceſſaries of life; hence, you find that in early times, the Venetians had it excluſively. The two laſt centuries it has belonged entirely to the Dutch; it is only ſince the war it has been transferred to Great Britain; it was one of the three ſources of Dutch wealth, and it may be conſidered advantageous to Great Britain, eſſentially advantageous I mean, only as it is a kind of nurſery of mariners. However, it produces to Great Britain a large revenue, but I maintain no real wealth.

Now this trade can be given to Ireland only by creation or transfer.—As to creation, I believe he will be rather a hardy politician who can declare, that an Union will have the effect of *creating* this trade for Ireland, whilſt Great Britain ſhall alſo retain her own in its full force and vigor. Indeed if any ſuch trade could be *created*, I am inclined to think that Great Britain would not have been without it ſo long. In fact, Ireland, as to this point, can only gain by the *transfer*; and perhaps this very word, which is peculiarly appropriated to the ſubject I am treating of, will enable you the better to underſtand ſome of the reaſons I have juſt now given on the ſubjects of population, commerce, and manufacture. Now in this inſtance, a transfer of that trade, or of any part of it,

from

from Great Britain to Ireland, muſt be the transfer of ſo much revenue reſource, pro tanto, as is transferred. This muſt be done expreſsly, or by operation of cauſes. If expreſsly, then I ſay, that Great Britain can never ſuffer us to take advantage of it, if we were fools enough to be gulled by her, for two reaſons—firſt, becauſe ſhe never will be inclined to make us ſo great a ſacrifice; and ſecondly, becauſe if ſhe were ſo inclined, ſhe could not, conſiſtent with her own exiſtence. And this brings me to conſider the abſtract nature of a transfer:—it is either gratuitous, or the reſult of a bargain. That in this inſtance Ireland can never experience ſuch a gratuity from Great Britain, is, I think, not altogether unnatural to ſtate—firſt, becauſe Ireland does not ſtand in need of it; ſecondly, becauſe if ſhe did, Great Britain could not afford it; and thirdly, becauſe in the courſe of between ſix and ſeven hundred years, I do not find *one ſingle* inſtance in which Great Britain ſeemed inclined to aſſiſt the commerce of Ireland, on the ground of favor; but I find that, on every occaſion and inſtance, ſhe has endeavoured to reſiſt her advancement, even on the ground of right. Then if this trade, either flowing from expreſs terms, or neceſſary conſequences of arrangement, be the reſult of a bargain—the next queſtion to be conſi-

dered is, which of the contracting parties is likely to gain by the bargain? It would be needleſs here again to repeat the many reaſons I have already urged in order to ſhew how impoſſible it will be for Ireland immediately or ultimately to gain in any one of theſe branches, when the very terms on which ſuch imaginary gain may be ſuppoſed to reſt, are the reſult of the Britiſh cabinet, and unaſked by the Iriſh people; the advantages themſelves (if any) uncertain in their extent, not permanent in their duration: whilſt the right to tax Ireland by a Britiſh Parliament is certain in its power, and only not aſcertained as to its extent and grievance. Again, I ſay, this very carrying trade can be of no uſe to Ireland, in its preſent ſituation, but on the contrary, highly injurious. The carrying-trade is two-fold—either for the purpoſe of tranſporting our own commerce, or the commerce of other people; now, with reſpect to our own commerce—in order to have the carrying trade, we muſt have the commerce, it would be abſurd indeed to have the ſhips and ſeamen, without any thing to put into the one, or employ the other; and I maintain it that any country, ſituated as is Ireland, will always have the means of tranſporting her own commerce, in proportion as that commerce encreaſes.—Now with reſpect to the other branch

branch of the carrying-trade—I ſay it would be injurious to Ireland in its preſent ſtate; and *never* could be of uſe, but for the purpoſe of ſupplying a marine, or raiſing a revenue for the purpoſe of paying ſomething towards the intereſt of an enormous debt, from which ſituation God protect us, I ſay. This trade, which tranſports the produce of foreign nations, employs a great capital, and a great number of hands; that ſame capital, and that ſame number of hands, employed to other purpoſes, would contribute much more to the wealth of the ſtate; and therefore it is that we ſee that this trade cauſed one of the three grand ſources of Dutch wealth—becauſe a country having no means of employing a capital and immenſe population on agriculture, muſt employ it on ſomething elſe. But even Great Britain cannot be ſaid to gain by this trade, farther than it conſtitutes a great ſupply of ſeamen; for the ſame capital and the ſame number of men employed in the cultivation of ſome of the waſte lands, would create a revenue, greater in extent, more permanent in its nature, and of more real general utility, than that ariſing from a trade which Great Britain herſelf has only acquired by the preſent ſtate of affairs in Europe.

Now a word as to the general utility of the influx of Britiſh capital, ſuppoſing ſuch a thing were likely.—As to this influx, I own I do not reckon much upon it; but ſuppoſing that ſuch an event might happen, I am one of thoſe who would affix but little value to it. I have no dependence on the capital, which in an infant ſtate ſets induſtry agoing; much more certain, and more valuable, is the capital acquired by induſtry, than the capital which it is imagined will create induſtry. The one is acquired through the gradual and inſtructive leſſons of experience in every particular, and I rather think, that the enjoyment of him who makes a fortune from nothing, is not inferior to that of him who increaſes a fortune already made. Sure I am, that national capital acquired by the long proceſs of laborious habits, and induſtry, is much more to be eſteemed, than the transfer of triple the amount, from any other country; to acquire capital, I ſay, in this way, it is neceſſary not only to have freedom of trade, but freedom of conſtitution; nay more, that trade is not worth having, the management and controul of which is intruſted to any interference under Heaven but your own. I have all my life laughed at the idea of thoſe, who thought a free trade and a free conſtitution could be of no uſe to us without a capital;

if

if ſuch could be an argument, Great Britain herſelf would have remained in eternal infancy; her friends and admirers would have little reaſon to dread the decline of her old age, Indeed Dalrymple mentions, on this head, alſo, a remark worth recording.—(Dal. Mc. vol. iii. Appendix 48.)—

"The common argument, that becauſe the "Iriſh have ſmall capital, they will never obtain "trade, is an argument for children. I once "aſked the late provoſt Cochrane, of Glaſgow, "who was eminently wiſe, and who had been a "merchant there for near ſeventy years, to what "cauſe he imputes the ſudden riſe of Glaſgow? "He ſaid, it was all owing to four young men of "talents and ſpirit, who ſtarted at one time in "buſineſs, and whoſe ſucceſs gave example to the "reſt.——The four had not ten thouſand pounds "among them, when they began."

Having applied myſelf to the conſideration of thoſe points on which it might be ſuppoſed Ireland might gain, and on which I think ſhe *cannot* gain, and for the elucidation of what I have thought proper to take a ſhort and conciſe ſurvey of Great Britain and its circumſtances—let me now carry the attention of the people of Ireland to thoſe points on which Ireland *muſt* loſe; and for this purpoſe, I think it neceſſary to take again, in this

place,

place, a ſhort and conciſe view of the ſtate of Ireland.. It's poſition and natural produce ſtand in no need of any comment. It contains according to the computation of Templeman, 17,536,000 acres. It were abſurd to compare here the eſtimates made by Petty, Davenant, Brackenridge, Halley, &c. I rather think that the number of acres in Ireland is about 18,000,000. Its population, is from the moſt authentic documents, as well from the cenſus taken in the year 1788, as from the reſult of the enquiry inſtituted by the late Gervais Parker Burke, Eſq. in the year 1791, at this day, at leaſt 5,000,000 of ſouls; the number of houſes, in this year, appear to be 701,102. The increaſe both of commerce and manufacture, has, I dare to ſay, ſurpaſſed the moſt ſanguine hopes of the moſt ſanguine patriots; and its national debt amounts only to 12,000,000, the intereſt of which, calculated at 5 per cent. is but £600,000. This ſtatement of our ſituation, which cannot be denied, does not, of itſelf, demand the interpoſition of any foreign interference for our advancement and proſperity. If our capital be not as great as that of Great Britain, our incumbrances are certainly in proportion infinitely leſs. Therefore on this view of the queſtion, what can Ireland gain by an Union with Great Britain? To which I anſwer, nothing,—and have already endeavoured

to

to prove it. But ſhe muſt inevitably loſe ſomething,—Firſt, in population,—becauſe ſuch muſt be to certain degrees the *neceſſary* reſult of the meaſure. Secondly, to a greater degree from the probable conſequences of the meaſure. When I ſpeak of emigration here, I do not ſpeak of emigration to Great Britain. The remaining population, independent of their cauſes, muſt be reſtrained by the ſyſtem of taxation, which will increaſe the difficulty of living. Again whilſt our manufactures and commerce cannot be extended, we muſt be ſubject to a certain ſyſtem for the purpoſe of raiſing a revenue; and give me leave to ſay in this place, that ſuch a taxation will be the more inſupportable, in as much as it will precede, and not be the reſult of, our proſperity. One of the chief reaſons which have enabled the people of Great Britain to ſupport their burdens is, that they have been enured to them by gradation; but woe to the unhappy country, that depends for its happineſs or proſperity, on the equitable arrangement, or humane forbearance, of the preſent Chancellor of the Exchequer of Great Britain!

I come now to conſider the queſtion of protection, which the advocates for an Union ſay, we receive from Great Britain, and for which (as one ground of argument) we are called on to ſurrender

our

our conſtitution. I am now only ſpeaking of that protection, which the fleets of Great Britain give to our commerce and manufactures, for as to any other protection I hold it out of the caſe, I am ſpeaking the proud conſtitutional language of your patriots, Grattan and Flood, not many years back—I ſay, there is but the ſhadow of liberty in a State which cannot protect itſelf. I am here ſpeaking of foreign aggreſſion—I am thankful and grateful for the ſervices of Great Britain, in the moment of our domeſtic misfortunes—I ſay then that the State that is not competent to its own protection is competent to claim no one right of a free State—and even on this ground, the hiſtory of this country gives a picture that my mind never contemplates but with emotions of rapture. I never have read of the exertions of a brave and generous people, either in the defence of their liberties, or for the recovery of them, that my mind did not make a compariſon favorable to the volunteers of Ireland. On the ſubject then of protection to our commerce and manufactures in time of war—the firſt argument that ſuggeſts itſelf is, that on principles of natural juſtice, the nation that cauſes the danger ſhould give the protection—For certainly on the ground of wars we have not much to anſwer, unconnected with Great Britain, I do think that on that ſubject we have been

been an unoffending, unambitious people for near ſeven centuries; but waiving any arguments which might have the appearance of applying itſelf to the humanity or generoſity of any nation, let me take up the queſtion on the more ſtern ground of right and the more perſuaſive argument of ſelf-intereſt: On the ground of right, I ſay, we are entitled to protection, becauſe near a century and a half ſince Ireland made a perpetual grant for an Iriſh marine; this fund England applied to other purpoſes, and therefore, on that ground is England bound to do in effect what Ireland has long ſince paid for. Secondly, The very protection by Great Britain is aſſiſted, I may ſay, in ſome manner created, by Ireland. Her inhabitants furniſh more, much more than a proportionable ſhare of her ſailors. But again, waiving the ground of right—which by the by I hold to be a ſlippery argument among nations—let us conſider the queſtion on the ground of all others, which in all countries, and all times, has withſtood the united force of right, humanity, juſtice, &c.—I mean the argument of ſelf-intereſt. Either it is the intereſt of Great Britain, according to our preſent connection, to protect our commerce, or it is not. If it is, then I ſay it is abſurd that ſhe ſhould be paid for what it is her intereſt to do; if it be not, then certainly ſhe has the right to withhold it, and we have the right not to aſſiſt her. This is ſeparation—granted—if Great Britain

 chooſe

chooſe it—but I ſay there is no reaſon by which the human underſtanding can be governed, that can allow Great Britain to name the price of the protection—and ſooner would I wiſh to ſee this country for ever ſeparated from Great Britain, or even ſunk in the Atlantic, than that it ſhould be in the power of the Britiſh miniſter to take from us, againſt our conſent, that conſtitution to which we were originally entitled, of which a barbarous policy deprived us, and which was regained for us, by the glorious exertions of our own people.

Having conſidered, in their order, the natural queſtions of population, agriculture, commerce, and manufactures, and as more immediately connected with them, the other queſtions of taxation and debt, as they would be likely to be affected by an Union; I am next to conſider how the conſtitution of this country, by becoming imperial, would be likely to be affected by ſuch an event—I believe it will hardly be doubted by any man, who has had the hiſtory of theſe countries, particularly from the time in which the Earl of Bute gained ſuch an unnatural aſcendancy over the council of the empire, that the prerogatives and influence of the crown have ſuffered little from parliamentary embarraſsment. Indeed the the hiſtory of the laſt fifteen years is one continued ſeries of compliance by Parliament with the ſuggeſtion of the crown.—Nor has any period of our

hiſtory

hiſtory, in any time, or under any monarchs, ſhewn ſuch a brilliant majority, as has had the Britiſh miniſter on all occaſions. It would be rather too difficult to perſuade you that *he* has been always right, and never in the wrong; on the contrary, I might ſay with ſome appearance of truth, that the whole ſyſtem in a great degree appears to be a ſyſtem of blunders and corrections, conceſſions and retractions, haughtineſs and ſervility, authority and compliance, meanneſs and a thirſt for power, which he has ſo dextrouſly managed, as to connect his own downfall with the downfall of Great Britain:—a ſtupendous, woeful ambition!

This dreadful event however, may yet be fruſtrated, the Britiſh Miniſter may find ſome other burial place than the ruins of his country. It is not impoſſible that ſome future parliament may condemn the meaſures of theſe times, as they have often done before, and while they cenſure the conduct of their predeceſſors, they may vote an impeachment of this immaculate man. Such was the caſe of the Earl of Oxford, all whoſe acts were ſanctioned by parliament. If ever *this* unhappy country ſhould be reſtored to its importance, if ever its people yielding to the imperious calls of common intereſt, and common calamity, ſhall become a United people, ſure, I am, that the conduct of this man, touching the affairs of *our country*, can excite nothing but emotions of indignation, and demand nothing but

vengeance. Let me however, return to the conſtitution.

The conſtitution of Ireland is compoſed of three eſtates—the King of Ireland, the Peers of Ireland, and the Commons of Ireland. What is the change by an Union?—A King of Great Britain, the Peers of Great Britain, and the Commons of Great Britain. In vain ſhall it be ſtated to me, that one-fifth of a repreſentation in an imperial parliament, will preſerve the conſtitution. 'Tis more than folly, 'tis arch-wickedneſs to ſay, that even a proportionate ſhare in an imperial parliament is not an annihilation of your conſtitution.

Your Commons will be removed from the ſcrutiniſing eye of thoſe that created them.—The magnitude of their political errors, like all other things, will be diminiſhed by diſtance. But ſuppoſe you could ſend one hundred men, as ſage as Solomon, and as juſt as Ariſtides, into the Britiſh parliament, of what avail could be their wiſdom and integrity? Can you puniſh the miſconduct of the Britiſh Commoner? Is he reſponſible to you? 'Tis a queſtion of *your* welfare that is agitated; it is propoſed by an Iriſh patriot; it is ſupported by *all* your members; well, what do you gain by it, if it ſhall pleaſe the Britiſh miniſter, to tell his Britiſh minions, it ſhall not be? Have I put an impoſſible, an improbable caſe? Did it ever happen? You know it

did

did—you know the Scots members to a man, voted againſt the meaſure of the malt tax.—What was the uſe of their unanimous vote? To record the triumph of Britiſh profligacy, and Scottiſh misfortune. Alas! had the Union with Scotland been a treaty, and not an incorporation of legiſlatures, the breach of it might have reſtored Scotland to its importance. It would not have had a mockery of repreſentation, to regiſter the power of its neighbour, and its own inſignificance.

I tell you again, the moment that *one ſingle member* over whom you have no control, contributes to the enaction of any law, which is to bind your people—that moment I ſay, the freedom of your conſtitution is at an end—that moment the eſſence of your conſtitution is altered.—Well, your Commoners are removed from the wholſome reſtraint of public opinion, which lives by conſtant exerciſe; let it ſlumber for a moment, and it aſſumes the morbid ſhape of death. Again, your Houſe of Lords—a wretched portion of your hereditary nobility are engulphed in the Peerage of Britain.—Is there another Charlemont to plead the cauſe of Ireland? He ſtays at home. The Britiſh Miniſter will not have him—the Britiſh Miniſter ſtarts from the approach of ſo much virtue—he ſhudders at the infuſion of ſo much worth.—Look at the miniſterial liſts of the Peers of Scotland! look at thar pup-

pet

pet-ſhew of repreſentation!—all, all ſet in motion and managed by one ſingle ſtate juggler.—So much for your conſtitution in the Britiſh parliament.—What will the imperial parliament give you? Will the influence of the crown, which for many years has been ſhaking the buttreſſes of the conſtitution, be diminiſhed?—Will the Iriſh members interfere between the Britiſh miniſter and the imperial people?—Look again to the Scottiſh elections! Scotland, I ſay, where miniſterial influence ſuffers not a ſingle interruption or encroachment; where the tranquillity of the electors was not diſturbed by the appearance of a ſingle advertiſement.—The Union with Scotland has been the *avant-courier* of the deſtruction of the Britiſh conſtitution; the Union with Ireland will leave nothing of it but the mournful recollection of its glories.—Have the people of England no feeling?—Or will it require the transfer our Iriſh militia to rouſe them from their apathy?—Will *they too* ſuffer this tremendous weight to be added to the already tremendous power of the influence of the crown?—Will they tamely ſubmit to this external Incubus on every exertion in the cauſe of liberty? Are *they too* alarmed? Has this mercurial principle laid hold of their underſtanding too? Has it palſied the pulſation of their hearts?—Will they ſuffer this abominable flagitious miniſter hereafter to laugh at the landed intereſt of England?

land?—Will they ſuffer him to perpetuate the principle by which he has maintained himſelf in power? Will they ſuffer any miniſter to depend for his power, on any thing but the good opinion of the people? Will they ſuffer him to engraft on the conſtitution, that excreſcence which ſooner or later will corrode its vitals? That mongrel principle which has detached the intereſts of the miniſtry from the ſoil, from the proprietors, from the cultivators, and ſupports itſelf, by adminiſtering unto the voracious appetite of ſtock-jobbing Jewiſh ſpeculation.—Aye, Engliſhmen, give him but the Scottiſh and Iriſh members, and a ſtanding army, and I would not exchange Cocker's Arithmetic for the whole catalogue of your rights. I tell you, the Iriſh ſenator over whom you have no reſponſibility, over whom the Iriſh people have no reſponſibility, will bargain away your conſtitution; I tell you the Iriſh ſoldier will make you bear it—mark my words.

A word now for the competency of the Iriſh parliament to change our conſtitution—I ſhall at once ſtate my opinion on that point—I am by profeſſion a lawyer, and I will not encumber with a ſingle "if or and" the opinion I ſhall give on this queſtion. *The parliament has no right to change the conſtitution.*—Yes, I repeat it, they cannot by right, though they may by power, change the conſtitution, and if they attempt it, the people have a right to

conſider

conſider the change as a diſſolution, and proceed to elect new members. It is not on a grand conſtitutional queſtion—it is not on the firſt principles of government, that my judgment is to be governed by the ſilly aſſertion of any man.—How does this caſe reſt on principle? how on authority? What is a member of parliament? a truſtee for a certain time for the people, appointed for that purpoſe, and for that time, and for no other purpoſe, and no other time, by the people.—Suppoſe the Parliament were to vote the right of taxation to exiſt in the crown—Would any man ſay they had a right ſo to do?—It would be a vain parade of learning to ſhew all the caſes, on which my doctrine is ſupported by principles and authority.—Let us ſee what the firſt of government writers ſays upon the ſubject:—

What

* 'The Legiſlature cannot transfer the power of making laws 'to any other hands; for it being but a delegated power from 'the People, they who have it cannot paſs it over to others. 'The people alone can appoint the form of the Common-'wealth, which is by conſtituting the Legiſlature, and appoint-'ing in whoſe hands that ſhall be; and when the people have 'ſaid, we will ſubmit and be governed by laws made by ſuch 'men, and in ſuch terms, nobody elſe can ſay other men ſhall 'make laws for them. The power of the Legiſlature, being de-'rived from the people by a poſitive voluntary act and inſtitu-'tion, can be no other than what that poſitive act conveyed,

which

What does Lord Hobart ſay, " whatever is " againſt natural reaſon and equity, is againſt law, " now if an act of Parliament were made againſt " reaſon and equity, that act was void."—So much for principles unerring, immutable, ſacred, inviolable principles.—Will the oppoſers of this doctrine take refuge in a precedent or precedents? Will they ſtand on the ſilly, inappoſite, inapplicable grounds (as a wretched Pamphleteer has done) of the Reformation, Revolution and Union

' *which being only to make Laws, and not to make Legiſlators*, the ' Legiſlative can have no power to transfer their authority of ' making laws, and place it in other hands.

LOCKE on Government, 2, 11, 141.

' Governments are diſſolved from within, when the Legiſla- ' tive is altered.—The conſtitution of the Legiſlative is the ' firſt and fundamental act of Society, whereby proviſion is made ' for the continuance of the Union, under the direction of per- ' ſons authoriſed thereto, without which no one man, or number ' of men amongſt them, can have authority of making laws, ' which ſhall be binding to the reſt. When any one or more ' ſhall take upon them to make laws, whom the people have not ' appointed ſo to do, they make laws without authority, which ' the people are not therefore bound to obey; by which means ' they come again to be out of ſubjection, and may conſtitute ' to themſelves a new Legiſlative as they think beſt, being in ' full liberty to reſiſt the force of thoſe, who, without authority, ' would impoſe any thing on them."

IBID, 2, 19, 212.

with Scotland? Or will they ſtand upon a caſe directly in point?—I admit it directly in point.—I mean the prolongation of the triennial Parliament in the year 1716.—This abominable meaſure was defended by its advocates, on the only reſource of failing intellect, and corrupt principles—*neceſſity*.—The principle I have ſtated, if it wanted ſtability, would acquire it from this miſerable exception; but I am dilating on a point on which there can be no *real* contrariety of opinion. To be brief, either this Union is againſt the conſent of the people, or it is not—If it is, then the accompliſhment of it is nothing leſs than tyranny—If it is not, then, where is the harm of having the conſtitutional ſanction of the people—Where is the danger?—If the people wiſh for it, God forbid they ſhould not have it—I ſhould in ſuch an event like other men ſubmit, retaining my own opinions; I ſhould think there was an end of virtue in my country, and with ſuch an opinion and ſuch a feeling, I ſhould "*dum nova canities*," ſet out upon my journey in ſearch of ſome country, more congenial to *my* notions of liberty and public ſpirit.—Yes, but the infected mouth-piece of the Britiſh Miniſter may tell you, that this is no ſeaſon for recurring to the conſtitutional will of the people; that is, he converts an irrefragable argument againſt the diſcuſſion of the meaſure at all

at

at this time, into a pitiful expedient for paſſing the meaſure, contrary to the conſtitution at all events, and moſt likely contrary to the wiſhes and inclinations of the people.

This mode of reaſoning never was generated but by power, it never was maintained but at the enormous expence of a ſtanding army—Woe to the ſtability of the Crown, if it were to reſt on ſuch foundations—Woe to the propagation of a doctrine, which ſuppoſes all treaſon againſt the Crown, and no treaſon againſt the People—I repeat it again and again, the Parliament has no right to paſs this meaſure.—It has no right even to diſcuſs it—I call upon the twelve Judges of England, upon the twelve Judges of Ireland, to contradict me on the principles I have laid down if I am wrong—I call upon the Law Officers of the Crown in both countries, to put themſelves between the Britiſh Miniſter and the Conſtitution; to put themſelves between the tyranny of the Miniſter and the rights of the People. I deſire them to go tell the King, that any agitation of this meaſure in Parliament, without the conſent of the people, ſhakes his throne to the center. His wicked Miniſter tell him, he will get empire; his real friends tells him, that empire is a burthen without the affections of his people. His wicked Miniſter tells him, he will get revenue; his friends

tell him, that revenue, created without previous consent, is robbery and uſurpation. Let this flagitious meaſure be paſſed in contempt of the people's opinion, and the point of the bayonet will be the only finger-poſt for revenue throughout the kingdom. I call upon the Law Officers of this country—upon the Judges of the land to contradict me in writing—in print—I am known to them all.—If they can maintain the argument againſt me, they will do it, they ought to do it, they ought to publiſh it.—I go farther, they ought, if they agree with me, to publiſh their opinion; there are among them more than one Holt; there is not one of them who does not recollect and admire this great Judge's conduct, in the caſe of the Ayleſbury men, wherein he ſhewed the Parliament, ſhewed them with effect, that the Conſtitution of England was greater and more powerful than Parliament.

Having endeavoured to conſider in their order, the grand internal cardinal points of any nation's riches and proſperity, as they would be likely to be affected by this meaſure, let me now bring your attention to thoſe external arguments of expediency, as they are called, and I apprehend they are reducible to three diſtinct heads: firſt, the ſtability of the connexion between Great Britain and Ireland; ſecondly, the nature of the connexion

that

that has hitherto exiſted, or in other words, the crimes and corruptions of the Britiſh Miniſter and the Goverment faction in Ireland; and thirdly, the ſtate of our religious feuds with their cauſes and conſequences. Now, with reſpect to the firſt point, connexion, I know but of two ſpecies either between individuals or nations, firſt, a connexion voluntary on both ſides, and bottomed of courſe, in a ſyſtem of mutual affections and intereſts. The ſecond, a connexion of force, or rather the addition of empire by means of a military ſyſtem; that I have not made a diviſion either inadequate or unlikely, may be ſeen by adverting to a Pamphlet written with ſome ability, &c. ſtiled "An "impartial view of the cauſes leading this country "to the neceſſity of an Union," &c. This Pamphlet, from many circumſtances inherent in it, appears to be of Caſtle growth. I need not go farther than one circumſtance—Is there a man out of the purlieus of the Caſtle, that in open defiance of every regard for character could paſs an unqualified panegyric on the perſon and performance of that man who opened the campaign againſt your liberties? If this Pamphlet be well written in point of ſtile it is totally deficient in point of argument. On a very ſhort view of it, you will find that its motive is deſpondency, and his argument is fear; the very worſt motive, and worſt reaſoner in the world.

Le

Let me tranſcribe for you one paſſage from this book: Speaking of the impracticability, not the inexpediency, of ſeparation, he ſays, "The ma-"rine of Great Britain is the moſt ſtupendous "power, not only this day in the world, but that "ever was in the world—Her power by land is "alſo, for her ſize, prodigious—After ſending "30,000 troops to this country, and troops to every "other quarter of the globe, ſhe has now 220,000 "armed troops, ready to march at a moment's no-"tice; and ſhall Ireland without a ſhip, or a gui-"nea to *pay* a ſoldier, except what ſhe derives "from the *bounty* of Britain, and which, to be "protected from a little mob of its own, is ob-"liged to depend upon the troops of that ſame "Britain, effect a ſeparation as long as Britain "pleaſes to reſiſt it, which will be for ever? It "is abſurd to argue it, but the effect of any effort "would be, that Britain would have *to conquer "Ireland again*, and Ireland would have to paſs "through another century of deſolation. That "proſpect is horrible. What then is the alterna-"tive—Union." Tell me now, who have been the firſt to broach this doctrine of Union or Sepa-ration? Has any one of us who have contributed our humble efforts to your ſervice, argued the queſtion on thoſe grounds? Have we not religi-

ouſly

ouſly abſtained from any abſtract diſcuſſion on this queſtion? Have we not looked on this part of the ſubject in the nature of an article of our faith, and have been ſatisfied of its intrinſic goodneſs without the neceſſity of a ſcrupulous examination? Have we not told you over and over again, that one of the grand deciſive grounds of our oppoſition to this fatal meaſure was, that we dreaded that very ſeparation ſome time or other, as the inevitable conſequence of it? But this bloody myſtery is beginning to bud full to your view. The State Pamphleteers are beginning openly to avow it—You *ſhall* be united—Does the Miniſter dare to ſay ſo? Is *that* the language to be held both in and out of Parliament? Ireland muſt be conquered again!!! Ireland has not a ſhip or a guinea to pay a ſoldier!—Oh gracious God!—Is it thus that our rights are to be diſpoſed of—Is it for this, that the deluded among us poured bleſſings on the heads of thoſe brave men who volunteered to ſave us from deſtruction? Save us from deſtruction, did I ſay—No, our danger was nearly over before their ſervices could be ſanctified by ſo divine a benediction—Our own ſoldiers, our unbought, unpurchaſed ſoldiers, ſaved us.—But why ſhould I deſpond?—Why deſpair of the commonwealth? The Miniſter may ſubdue us for a ſeaſon—He may make a pro-

vince

vince—He may make of our country a wretched thing of his own manufacturing—He may one day himſelf, like the High Prieſt of Baal, fall the ſacrifice to the idol of his own creation—Oh! my countrymen, read this—read this, I ſay—and tell me if in the tomb of common calamity we ought not to depoſit the unnatural remains of our deadly remorſe and animoſity—Will the Britiſh Miniſter ſay openly, that he will wage war upon us? Suppoſe for inſtance, a majority in the Houſe in favour of Ireland—Is war immediately to be proclaimed? Will the Heralds of the Britiſh Miniſter march thro' the ſtreets of this proud city and at its corners proclaim War by the Britiſh Miniſter againſt the King of Ireland? Let him dare to do it—But the moſt *ſtupendous marine in the univerſe!! Two hundred and twenty thouſand troops ready to march at a moment's notice!!!*—a fine battle-piece this—a *genuine ſalvator roſa*—Look at its contraſt! The fair figure of Hibernia, without a ſhip, without a guinea to pay a ſoldier, in tears, bedewing with her ſacred brine, that landſcape, drawn by the hand of ungenerous, ungrateful, unprincipled authority—Dry thoſe tears, Hibernia—there might be room for tears, if tears were the beſt, the proudeſt protection for the menaced liberties of your people.

Let us turn from this black, gloomy, and portentous ſide of the picture, wherein can be ſeen but

but the gloom of desolation.—Let us look to that side of it, where light and shade are beautifully harmonized; let us see, I say, how that kind of connexion is likely to be affected by this measure; let us examine that connexion which is grounded on common affection, and common interest; and here too do I take leave to say, that as between nations, there is no voluntary connexion that can be permanent, but a connexion of interests—alas! how few, even in private life, have negatived this principle.—But among nations, no Statesman has a right to reckon on abstract affections; they are but ancillary to the grand point—Interest. How then is this voluntary connexion likely to be affected by this measure?—I think I may divide, as to political opinions this nation into two parties—the loyal, and the disloyal—I know that a more copious, comprehensive, and able division has been already made on this head *.—With respect to the latter, those I mean whose wishes and objects are separation—Is there any man so weak in understanding, so little acquainted with the qualities of the heart, so deficient in observation, as to believe that an Union will convert a *single* man of this

* See Mr. P. Burrowes's able speech in the report of the debate of the Bar Meeting, on Sunday, 9th December last.

deſcription into a loyal and ſteady ſupporter of the rights of the crown? Is it neceſſary for me to argue this matter more at large? There is already a living argument in the face of every United Iriſhman in Ireland—The gloom of paſt diſcomfiture has been exchanged for the ſmile of anticipated ſucceſs—You know they are ready to run riot with joy—But the loyal—thoſe very men who but lately interpoſed between the crown and the populace—thoſe very men who underwent the moſt trying fatigues, and the moſt outrageous violations of the ordinary habits of life—who voluntarily did ſo—thoſe men, I ſay, who actually ſaved this country, who fortified and confirmed that ſpecies of connexion which alone is ſuited to the feelings and dignity of the people of Ireland.—Look at thoſe men as you paſs thro' your ſtreets—look at their countenances as you travel through your country—Can you read in their features, the character of their thoughts? Has the agitation of this queſtion given unto their features the unerring demonſtrations of joy, of ſatisfaction, of peace? Have you heard many of them ſpeak? What ſay they? Are they ſatisfied? Traverſe, as I have done, the great area of this majeſtic city—and you will ſee no cauſe for exultation—thoſe that think with ardor, ſpeak out—thoſe that think with caution, look with ſorrow and diſtruſt.——You cannot hope, I ſay, to for-

tify

tify by this ſad meaſure the connexion between us —that kind connexion only, which is dignified and permanent—that connexion which is " enthroned in the hearts" of men—that connexion which is the beauteous perſonification of God's holy precept—that connexion which is " peace and harmony among men."

I am now to conſider the ſecond topic of my laſt arrangement—I mean the *nature* of the connexion that has exiſted between Great Britain and Ireland. —This is made, by the advocates of the Union, a ground on which the conſtitution of our country is to be ſurrendered—Let us conſider it as an argument—It is agreed on all hands, that the nature of this connexion is very bad. In order to make the badneſs of this connexion a ground for a total change, two things indiſpenſable in my opinion ſhould previouſly appear.—1ſt. That there is no other way than by a total fundamental change, to get rid of this ſort of connexion,—and 2dly, That ſuppoſing this to be the caſe, that in *this* particular, the change muſt be for the better.—This of neceſſity leads me to conſider, what the nature of that connexion is, which has given ſo much offence to all parties, and how it has originated and grown into its ſtate of frightful maturity.—I ſhall not be long—I do not mean to write a hiſtory—I only wiſh to give a ſketch.

In general terms then, I may ſay, that Great Britain and Ireland being both independent kingdoms, have been connected by means of their mutual intereſts, and this has been ſtrengthened and fortified by the union of the two crowns—The king of Ireland not reſiding in Ireland, but in England; of courſe his Majeſty's council is there too; ſo that touching the affairs of Ireland, his Majeſty has been pleaſed in the firſt inſtance to be governed by his Britiſh miniſters.——It would be needleſs in this place to ſtate the enormous influence of the crown—how it has been by degrees acquired, and what will be the likely conſequences of it—nor is it neceſſary to give a chronological hiſtory of the influence of the Britiſh miniſter in this country; ſo that I ſhall bring you back only to the queſtion of the Regency, from the date of which, I think it appears inconteſtable, that the Britiſh miniſter no longer concealed his hoſtility to your country; but has acted upon a ſyſtem, which has been conceived in darkneſs, hatched by treachery on one hand, and corruption on the other, led through the frightful avenues of civil diſſenſions, religious feuds, and all the horrors of rapine and blood—and finally brought to the light in the ghaſtly ſhape of the murderer of your conſtitution, your liberties, your laws.—This is not an exaggerated picture, believe me—nor is it the reſult of ſudden workmanſhip—it has been painting, for a long time,

time, with all the genius of a painter, who having his palette well ſet, and copiously furniſhed, proceeds with great order and induſtry through all the gradations of finiſhed art.

I will not ſtate to you what had been the conduct of the Britiſh miniſter in the year 1785, not quite two years after that act, by which the Parliament of Great Britain *renounced* any right that ſhe had ever claimed, to bind by Britiſh laws the Iriſh people. This was the grand Charter of Ireland—I will not, I ſay, enter into any details of this man's conduct on that occaſion; ſuffice it to remark that Charles Fox, in the Britiſh Senate, expoſed his covered hoſtility to the Iriſh people—and in a blaze of eloquence never to be forgotten by Ireland, is at at this moment to be found the juſt chaſtiſement due to ſuch an unprincipled, mean, and treacherous attack, upon the infant independence of your country. I ſhall forbear to mention the fate of thoſe propoſitions in this country—You all know it—It never can be forgotten—It is the ſplendid monument of parliamentary exertion.—What had you done in the year 1785—without a Parliament? The conduct of your Parliament on the regency, was not well calculated to ſoften, in this haughty vindictive man, the recollection of his diſcomfiture in 1785. The unexpected recovery of the King enabled him

him to ſet his fatal deſigns in motion. At this time (the regency I mean) your Patriots, the talented part of your Parliament, thoſe men to whom you had for ſome years been accuſtomed to look for parliamentary protection, were proſcribed.

The ſucceſs of an intereſted ſpeculation flung to the pinnacle of power a ſet of men from whoſe abilities you could expect little; from whoſe virtues you could expect leſs.—They were by nature, and by habit, the beſt ſuited to the views of the Britiſh miniſter, and no doubt he thought ſo.—Of thoſe men however let me ſay, that I can ſcarcely think it poſſible, that they would at the commencement of their employment have liſtened to a meaſure, which the miniſter with more cunning, and certainly with more effect, thought proper to reſerve for a more diſtant, but more certain ſucceſs. My real opinion is, that had this meaſure been propoſed to thoſe men at that time, it would have met in the boſoms of thoſe very men a cool reception—No.—The miniſter calculated better. He ſaw that many things were to be done, before he could hope for any ſucceſs,—the ſyſtem by which our ruin was to be accompliſhed was admirably well organized.—The firſt ſtep was, to deſtroy all confidence between the Parliament

liament and the people—to make, in fact, the Parliament of Ireland, any thing but the Parliament of Ireland—To force the people to look to any thing with more hope, than the Parliament of its own creation. To drive the people to aſk for this very meaſure—To the accompliſhment of his views in this reſpect, one thing was eſſential;—— a large majority——Hence by a maſter-ſtroke of policy, the partition between individuals of places and penſions—Hence the creation of innumerable places, that can only be recollected, through the medium of their uſeleſsneſs and their expence.—Hence the open, competition ſale of the Peerage. It was not that this man poiſoned the very fountain of public honor, but in fact, while he waged *open* war againſt the rights of the people, he waged *covered* war againſt the conſtitutional prerogatives of the Crown. The people who are the victims, will look with jealouſy and diſtruſt on that power, by which they have been or may be ſacrificed; and while the prerogatives, and the influence of the Crown are mortal, are periſhable, the rights of the people are immortal, are eternal.

This abominable, flagitious ſale to vice, of that which ſhould be the excluſive monopoly of virtue, made no inconſiderable impreſſion on the public mind;

mind; the buſineſs itſelf was conducted at the Caſtle in ſo clumſy, ſo awkward a manner, that it was expoſed in all the nakedneſs of hideous deformity, to the very eyes of the public. Great ſenſations of courſe, loud whiſpers, unconcealed ſymptoms of public indignation. A motion is made in the Houſe of Commons, touching this foul, diſgraceful, unconſtitutional, tranſaction; what was the fate of that motion? It failed like many others. The facts, as ſtated, were at the riſque of every thing dear to the characters of men, offered to be proved at the bar of your Houſe of Commons. Was this the ſubject, I aſk you, of all others, the moſt ſuited to the dignity of parliamentary inveſtigation? Either the miniſters were guilty of this, or they were not; if not, why then ſhun the inveſtigation—if they were, can't you draw the concluſion? Had a common tax-gatherer been maltreated in extorting from the half-famiſhed peaſant the duty upon his wretched ſalt, you would have had the whole treaſury-bench marſhalled in vindictive array upon a common application;—but a queſtion of the laſt conſtitutional importance, finds itſelf poſtponed to the more important conſideration of the previous queſtion.

The circumſtances of the times (if it were not impiety to think it) ſeemed, as it were, pre-diſpoſed by Providence for the accompliſhment of this

this man's plans and deſigns on the liberties of our country. About this time there aroſe that ſociety, which, under conſtitutional pretexts, aimed at nothing leſs than the overthrow of our conſtitution; the times were exceedingly favorable to the growth of this ſociety. The Parliament had already fallen much in the public eſtimation;—I need not give you the hiſtory of this period—no doubt you all know it—a ſtupendous event, of which I was an eye-witneſs, ſeemed to threaten with imminent danger the European ſyſtem; it menaced with the frown of anticipated authority all the old and venerable inſtitutions, by which the different ſtates of Europe had been for centuries kept together; it *profeſſed* to make the ſacred rights of the people the motives and foundation of its conduct. It was an engine, a mighty engine, for a wicked faction, with the aſſiſtance of a diſcontented people. It is not for me, here, to give you my opinions on this dreadful event, I have already given them in print, to thoſe of you to whom the name of an obſcure individual is unknown, ſuffice it to ſay, that on this occaſion, I was the humble, but the only auxiliary of the ſublimeſt advocate, the cauſe of *Monarchy* ever recorded or ever will record—Oh! immortal man! had it but pleaſed Providence, to ſpare you unto your native, your beloved country—I ſhould at this moment, fill

the ſame dignified ſtation that firſt brought me to your notice.—Gracious God, what an advocate have you loſt! I knew his ſentiments upon this very queſtion—I communicated to him ſhortly before his death my alarms, and I found that in the almoſt exhauſted lamp of life, there yet remained on the ſubject of *your* rights, *your* liberties, the brilliancy and fullneſs of ſolar illumination.

The event of the French revolution ſtopped for a moment the courſe of my narration—I muſt bring you back---I was ſpeaking of that ſociety, whoſe exiſtence has marked with blood the æra of its birth. This very ſociety, whoſe views were directed againſt the very being of the monarchy, was by the miniſter of our monarch, converted into an inſtrument of our ruin and diſgrace. It was not ſufficient that our Parliament had loſt the confidence of the people---- (I mean the majority in Parliament). It was neceſſary to *blaſt the hopes of the people*, in their confidence in the oppoſition---It was neceſſary that the people ſhould have no hold at all in the Parliament—It was neceſſary that the majority ſhould appear to be corrupt, and that the oppoſition ſhould appear to be traitors. —Was it a conſtitutional motion in favor of the people? The mover and ſupporters were by the friends of the miniſter, both in and out of Parliament, branded with the epithets of Innovators,

novators, French Republicans, United Iriſhmen, &c. By theſe means, that conſtitutional oppoſition, which I have no heſitation in declaring, is the proudeſt ſentinel of our rights, became the object of our ſuſpicions—It was repreſented by the agents of the miniſter, as a kind of parliamentary edition of the works of diſaffection and treaſon.—Having thus ſucceeded by bribery on the one hand, and induſtrious miſrepreſentation on the other, to render your Parliament odious to you: It occurred to the Britiſh miniſter, that even on that head ſomething was yet undone—What was it? to make that very Parliament contemptible to itſelf—to make it the wanton, unprovoked, unirritated aggreſſors, and then to make it ſwallow its words—It was a queſtion of the Catholic claims.—The Members of your Parliament were *ſent*, aye! I ſay, *ſent*, by the Britiſh miniſter poſt haſte to your ſeveral counties—For what? to put an ex-parliamentary extinguiſher on thoſe very claims—to prevent the poſſibility of their diſtant, their humble and obſequious approach even unto the threſhold of your parliamentary tabernacle—Well—this might not have been inconſiſtent.—But Gracious God! think of the triumph of the Britiſh miniſter over the wretched remnant of Iriſh conſiſtency, when thoſe very men were *ordered*, by that ſame mi-

niſter into the ranks of Catholic enlargement, and on the day of battle there you found them.

About the time I am now ſpeaking of, an event happened in England, which of all others contributed to ſtrengthen the means of the miniſter, in his views againſt the common conſtitution, and his already half-accompliſhed enterprizes againſt the liberties of Ireland.——I am ſpeaking of the coalition of the Duke of Portland.——This ſingle event has been a purchaſe, a phyſical force I may ſay, which has been uſed with dreadful ingenuity and effect.——That oppoſition which had been the luminous, the jealous, the vigilant, the ſleepleſs, the proudly conſtitutional guardian of your liberties, found itſelf at once weakened and diſcomfited by the means of uncommon artifice, on the one hand, and uncommon dupery on the other.—Its ſpirit began to be broken with its ſtrength, and after ſeveral vigorous but ineffectual ſtruggles, weakened in numbers, and diſheartened in ſpirits, it ſank into a ſtate of political annihilation.—It ſeceded—I do not mean to canvaſs here the wiſdom of that meaſure. Sure I am, that it was not unnatural.—The body that has been almoſt exhauſted in repeated ſtruggles, has been known to make one laſt grand effort, and then lie down and die.

I am nearly touching on that period, at which an event of the moſt extraordinary nature, the moſt

diabolical

diabolical purpoſe, and moſt woeful conſequence arreſted the attention of every thinking mind in Ireland.—In two counties there raged an open war, carried on with too fatal ſucceſs by a ſet of miſcreants, who had the impiety to ſay, that they were fighting on the ſide of the ever-living God.—Their unarmed, houſeleſs, naked, famiſhed victims, ſuch of them as eſcaped from the ſword or conflagration, were ſeen in the heart of a free country, ſtalking in herds through the fields, in all the wretchedneſs of heart-breaking nudity and want—every ditch in that part of the country was a convenient burying place—alas, thoſe plenteous fields afforded to its former occupiers no other accommodation.—All this happened under the very noſe of a ſtrong executive government, within the view of a conſiderable military force.—The common calls of humanity, independent of the motives of public duty, procured for theſe unhappy, innocent ſufferers, the unbought eloquence of ſome of the members of your oppoſition.—A motion, temperate in its nature, conſtitutional in its principle, and humane in its object, met the ſame fate that generally attended all the exertions in favour of your people.—Was this a fit, a dignified, an imperative ſubject of parliamentry enquiry? When a motion of this nature meets not even the polite reception of hoſpitality, are we not to aſk what the real ſtate of the caſe is, and what can be the motives for a conduct unaccounted for on any ſound idea of the

underſtanding

underſtanding, or any honorable affection of the heart; the truth was plain, was very plain—the ſyſtem was developing itſelf every hour.

In conſequence of that coalition, of which I have already ſpoken, a nobleman—the hereditary repreſentative of the Marquis of Rockingham, the repreſentative of his virtues—was at the expreſs deſire of his ſovereign inveſted with the government of Ireland. The ſtate of the country had appeared to make it adviſeable to ſelect a man of great conſequence, and incorruptible integrity—he however was little aware of the real ſprings that were in actual motion—His friend the illuſtrious Edmund Burke foreſaw that Lord Fitzwilliam might be the means of doing much good to his native country, and he, with others, uſed his utmoſt endeavours to prevail on his Lordſhip to fill a ſtation never ſolicited, and accepted with reluctance. His friends, however, thought it adviſeable that the *expreſs* conditions of his adminiſtration ſhould be previouſly aſcertained—I know theſe facts—I was at Beaconsfield about that time—The Earl of Fitzwilliam arrived—his very preſence diffuſed harmony and peace through the land—in truth he deſerved your affections—his miſſion was toleration—his object was peace—I forbear to ſtate here, the particulars of this ſhort adminiſtration—I fear I have grown into too great length already—He was recalled—Why? Becauſe peace

between

between Iriſhmen was not the concealed object of his miſſion—And this venerable nobleman in the honeſt indignation, which inſulted virtue always feels, has given unto us a gloomy monument of great virtue, ſacrificed by great crime.—This very meaſure had at that time taken a kind ſhape in that forge, wherein the maſter workman is any thing and every thing.—Liſten to my Lord Fitzwilliam's own words —He receives a letter from the Duke of Portland on the Catholic queſtion, in which his Grace ſays —" That the deferring this queſtion, would be not merely an expediency, or a *thing to be deſired* for the preſent, but the means of doing a greater ſervice to the Britiſh EMPIRE than it has been capable of receiving ſince the Revolution, or at leaſt ſince the UNION!"—Mark theſe two words, *Empire*, and *Union*—What! a letter expreſsly written to a virtuous Lord Lieutenant on the peculiar affairs of Ireland, never condeſcends to mention any benefit to *Ireland* —No—Empire is the word—this ſingle ſacrilegious word, which for ſix hundred years of our exiſtence ſtood between us and our rights, which in all the exertions for our liberties, has been the ſtrong entrenchment within which your enemies took poſt—and from which they were driven by the Volunteers of Ireland with diſcomfiture and diſgrace.

The Earl of Camden ſucceeded to the Lieutenancy of Ireland—It is not for me to ſpeak in this

place

place of his private virtues—perhaps they were many—his friends ſaid ſo.—His adminiſtration was a moſt fatal one.—This ſociety had taken deep root—every act of the government gave to it a purchaſe, by which it was enabled to move the great body of the people.—The government were aware of this, and their policy was, that the movement ſhould be premature—hence your whipping, hanging, burning, free-quarter ſyſtems.—The government, however, ſucceeded, and the calends of May 1798, were written in blood.

Thus have I endeavoured, through the means of a haſty ſketch, in which certainly many important matters are omitted, to bring you directly to the date of our recent misfortunes—and having to the beſt of my judgment, (and I muſt ſay, with a ſincerity that becomes the humble advocate of ſo righteous a cauſe) traced the hiſtory of thoſe plans by which a connexion of mutual affections and intereſts has been converted into the ſource of all our ſorrows, let me now for a moment aſk your indulgence, while I ſpeak of the natural mortality of this ſyſtem.—Believe me, it is not entitled in any reſpect to the honor of eternity—ſave in the remembrance of the horrors it has cauſed—I ſpeak it in the honor of your conſtitution, that this ſyſtem forms no part of it—it is a vile excreſcence, that has grown into hideous magnitude upon its fair form—it wants but the knife

knife, or the cauſtic, to remove it—How can a ſyſtem be ſaid to be eternal, which is founded on the confuſion of principles, and principles of confuſion? How can a ſyſtem be called even permanent, when the puniſhment that is due to crime, is defeated only by the commiſſion of new crimes? No wonder that the torch of diſcord ſhould ſupply the only light, by which theſe men could hope to ſee their way through ſuch a ſyſtem as this; a ſyſtem, which would impiouſly check the riſing ſprings of life, and cripple the bounteous movements of Providence; a ſyſtem, which would fit the growing properties of nature to the ſtunted meaſure of a corrupt mind, and a wicked heart; a ſyſtem which would, with helliſh boldneſs and effrontery, ſet itſelf in hoſtile array againſt the expreſs will of God; a ſyſtem in ſhort, that would pervert the charity of heaven into the wrath of hell, and metamorphoſe the fertility of nature into the deſolation of art.

I tell you this ſyſtem cannot laſt—I tell you the miniſter of England, and his faction here, know it; that faction, which having ſold its corruption at a high price to a venal purchaſer, would now ſet up their crimes to auction—a faction, I ſay, that having made war upon the rights of the people, would take ſanctuary from their crimes at the altar whereon your liberties are to be ſacrificed.—The miniſter has endeavoured to prop his falling ſyſtem—it will

do—it is built of rotten materials on a rotten foundation.—The faction here had put their ſhoulders to ſupport it—they have been obliged to quit their ſtation, leſt they ſhould find themſelves buried in its ruins—I tell you again, the ſyſtem is tumbling—it is at this moment almoſt proſtrate before you. The miniſter and the faction are afraid they cannot *ſafeley* part with their ſyſtem—they muſt;—they propoſe to you to exchange a rotten, falling, proſtrate ſyſtem for EXTERMINATION.

If you have by this time obſerved the abſurdity and impiety of giving to a ſyſtem of ſin, one of God's attributes, it is time I ſhould ſpeak to you of the *manner* in which your rights have been, and are to be diſpoſed of.—Are you even previouſly conſulted on a vital meaſure of *your* proſperity—I confeſs I am one of thoſe who would give the epithet of intereſted officiouſneſs to any interference in my favour, unleſs there had been with myſelf ſome previous concert or communication.—Believe me, *nations* are never ſatisfied with the dumb and ſilent emblems of charity.—This meaſure, which all muſt admit, contains within itſelf, the conſideration at leaſt, of every thing that is dear to us as a nation, is actually ſettled—Where? in Ireland? No—in the cabinet of Great Britain—By whom? By the ſame Britiſh miniſter and a few *favourites* of the faction.—

tion.—The Britiſh miniſter *orders* his minions to attend him—Behold them in council—when uproſe

" Belial, in act moſt graceful and humane;
" A fairer perſon loſt not heaven; he ſeem'd
" For dignity compos'd and high exploit:
" But all was *falſe and hollow*; though his tongue
" Dropp'd manna, and could make the worſe appear
" The better reaſon, to perplex and daſh
" Matureſt counſels: for his *thoughts were low*;
" *To vice induſtrious*, but to *nobler deeds*
" *Timorous and ſlothful*: yet he pleas'd the ear,
" And with perſuaſive accent thus began:"—

Would to God, I could in the language of the divine poet, make for my Belial the ſpeech which his character ſo well deſerves, and which my humble talents are ſo ill ſuited to ſupply; but not being able to make *ſuch* a ſpeech, I think it wiſer and ſafer to truſt rather to your imagination, than my own diction. The matter however being decided, Belial ſends his minions acroſs to ſee his orders executed;—the chief agent or oſtenſible broker firſt arrives—this young gentleman happens to be an Iriſhman—his outſet in life was marked by a puerile effort to lift himſelf into notice on the ſhoulders of the people.—He lay however ſome time on the ſhelf, when the acci-

dent of a family connexion firſt brought him to your notice, through the medium of ſome official ſituation; I believe he held the important and active office of Privy Seal.—The viſitation of a dangerous illneſs contributed to bring him ſtill further into view, and in addition to the laborious duties of his former office, he undertook to be the deputy-uſher of the grand taſk-maſter of Ireland. He had now acquired much power, and he reſolved to make the firſt uſe of it in an attack upon an act of Parliament; he would not vacate his ſeat; he ſaid ſo, and ſo it was; he never paſſes the ſtreets without bringing to the recollection of the people, how eaſy it is as matters have been going on, to evade an act made in their favour;—he has among many of us been called a walking violation of an act of Parliament. ——'Tis ſaid he piques himſelf upon a likeneſs to his employer; unfortunately there is ſome, for they both arrived at unmerited power at an early period in life; but Belial has talents.—This young gentleman might roll on, in the ordinary rotation of life, unheeded, and unnoticed, ſave by the ſucceſsful exertions of his own vanity; for he is fond of talking, and I need not tell you the fate that has generally attended men of that deſcription.—However, behold him arrived at the gilded pinnacle of power, for he has ceaſed to be the de-

puty

puty, and is now become the principal, and as he actually receives the *profits* of the employment, ſo it is to be hoped he will have the decency to vacate his ſeat.—Behold him freſh from the mint wherein thoſe mighty *terms* have been coined;—ſee him ſeated in his auction-room, wherein he advertiſes he will receive propoſals for every ſpecies of Parliamentary manufacture.—He is not thinly attended, the buſineſs is ſet agoing, and ſo tickled are the fancies of the whole tribe, at the very idea of a *bargain*, that ſtrange as it may appear, *you, even you, the People of Ireland*, cannot preſent yourſelves to their imaginations, but in the ſhape of a vendible commodity.—It is really lamentable, that it ſhould be in the power of Belial, to make a young gentleman perfectly hateful, who might be perfectly inoffenſive without his interference.*—To be ſerious, my countrymen, believe me there is nothing of eternity in this ſyſtem, I promiſe you,

* "Be juſt before you are generous"—Belial, as is natural to *him*, reverſes a wiſe and honeſt principle—as a Steward, without the previous permiſſion of his principal, he undertakes to give a ſum of near two millions of the money of his principal (who owes more than ſhe is worth) as a favour to another, who neither aſks for it, nor wiſhes for it, and who will not take it moſt poſitively; but yet Belial carries his romantic generoſity ſo far, that he would, if he could, enforce his compliment at the point of the bayonet.

it

it is nearly proſtrate already; but were it even to laſt a long time, yet would I not exchange it for another, worſe, and eternal. I ſhall conclude my obſervations on this head, in the words of that divine poet I have already quoted to you:

"This horror will grow mild, this darkneſs light,
"Beſides what hope the never-ending flight
"Of future days may bring, what charms, what change,
"Worth waiting, ſince our preſent lot appears
"For happy though but ill, for ill not worſt,
"*If we procure not unto ourſelves more woe.*"

I am at length arrived at the laſt, not leaſt ſource of our preſent calamities, that reſervoir from which a foreign power is ſupplied by domeſtic weakneſs—I am alluding to our religious feuds —"The Church is in danger"—Theſe words have drunk deep of the living ſtreams of blood—and in the ſelf-created cauſe of the *all-merciful God*, has been found the inexhauſtible ſource of warfare and depopulation—Is it neceſſary for me to prove unto the Orangeman, how little he has to dread from Catholic claims, Catholic pretenſions, or Catholic ſucceſs? Their claims are the claims of righteouſneſs, earned through the trying proceſs of long depreſſions and uninterrupted misfortunes, earned through all the rigors of ſevere and unmerited pilgrimage

grimage and penance; their pretenſions are the pretenſions of unrewarded loyalty, diſdaining to ſtand (I would ſtake my eternal Salvation on it) on the abominable foundations of reſumption or injuſtice; their ſucceſs has undergone the fate of virtue, thwarted by the induſtrious machinations of crime.—I tell the Orangeman, *(that forced growth of the preſent adminiſtration)* that he has no *real* danger to apprehend from Catholic claims, pretenſions or ſucceſs.—I tell the Orangeman that he is not a creature of ſpontaneous, natural growth —I tell him, he is a creature of miniſterial manufacture—I tell him, the only danger he has ſeen, has been a danger created for him, purpoſely, maliciouſly, intereſtedly created for him;—I tell the Orangeman, if he were to ſcrutiniſe with microſcopic ſcrupulouſneſs the whole ſyſtem of human notions and human affections, he could not get an inch of ground to ſtand on—I tell the Orangeman, that he has been made the *active* dupe of Machiavelian policy—I tell the Orangeman, that he has ſurrendered the natural, amiable, domeſtic, control of his underſtanding and his heart, to the unnatural, extrinſic, hateful, management of intereſted, unwholſome, artifice and deception.—Thoſe who compoſe the Orange-ſocieties, cannot be born with propenſities of this peculiar deſtination;

tion; let no man tell me, that an orange-man was by *nature* calculated to be the living record of hatred and animoſity to him who wiſhes him no ill, and intends him no harm. Oh wicked policy! Oh deteſtable artifice! which has contrived, that while the human intellect has been enlightened, and humanliberality and toleration extended in other parts of the world, it ſhould be our fate to be re-plunged, with ſudden rapidity, into all the misfortunes and horrors of bigotry and ſuperſtition! This cannot be the natural proceſs of our underſtandings, or our hearts—No; it is the unrighteous triumph of preconcerted malignity, over the lamentable imbecillity of our nature. Aſk yourſelves, if ſome of you have not been frightened, and others of you have not been goaded, into a ſyſtem of mutual, unnatural, antipathy. If this abominable ſyſtem had been the offspring of your natures, its operations had been ſteady and immutable. You know it well, I ſay, that not many years are paſt, ſince, forgetting thoſe animoſities, which are the growth of barbariſm, and never the offspring of civiliaation, you began to love each other; you know that love was in a progreſſive ſtate of advancement. —Had this divine work been completed, you would have furniſhed but ſlender materials for watchful, ſatanical, jealouſy; the arch-fiend of

miſchief

miſchief has interpoſed between you and your happineſs; but our errors, like thoſe of our firſt parents, are yet redeemable—let us ſubmit to the inferiority of our condition, and become our own redeemers.

My addreſs to the Catholics is ſhort,—I tell the Catholic, he has no right to ſacrifice at the altar of political ſin (diſcovered, detected ſin) the liberties of his country, poſſibly the unincumbered inheritance of his own children; I tell the Catholic, he has no right to take refuge from a paſſing, periſhable, danger, in theboſom of Extermination. I caution the Catholic to beware leſt, in ſtarting from the already blunted inſtrument, he may not fall back into the arms of death. In the name of eternal truth, in the name of common humanity, in the language of that Being which preſcribes to us to live in common charity with one another—I call on the Orange-man to throw off that drapery which ſo ill becomes his nature, and give it back to him who gave it—I call on the Catholic to come forward, and ſtate to the Orange-man his views, and quiet his alarms—I call upon them both, to beat down this unnatural ſyſtem of antipathy without cauſe, and hoſtility without provocation. In the name of our common liberties I call upon ſome Proteſtant body, to come forward at this dreadful criſis—I call upon

ſome Corporation, to come forward, and ſeize upon the unoccupied poſt of glory—I call upon them, to erect unto themſelves an everlaſting monument of ſplendor—I call upon them to earn, while they have it in their power, this inſcription:

They adminiſtered ſpeedy and effectual relief
Unto the gaſping, almoſt lifeleſs, liberties of their country.

Having endeavoured to ſhew unto you your *real* ſituation, and the *real* cauſes which have contributed to it, and in the doing of which, I have travelled through many a ſcene of woe—let me, for the preſent, change, as it were, the nature of my ſubject, and give to the ſtate-libeller a word, by way of recreation:—This man, having proceeded through all the regular gradations of flippant compliance, finds himſelf, at length, transformed from a common Engliſh writing-clerk, into the ſtation and capacity of an Iriſh governor!—In *your* country, and by *your* means, he has been bloated into importance; of courſe he owes you much—and indeed he has not been ungrateful; I for one do thank him—nay, I have the preſumption to thank him in your name; a very wicked heart, with the aſſiſtance of a very crooked underſtanding, has enabled him to render great ſervice to the ſtate. In his intentional hoſtility is to be found the eſſence of

of involuntary kindneſs. While with one hand he is ineffectually endeavouring to plunder Ireland of her rights, he is, with the other, actually re-paying her for her favors. This man has written a book upon *your* affairs; it has had a moſt extenſive circulation—it has done much, and will do more good. I proceeded in it with that equanimity of mind, which, you know, a certain ſenſation inſpires, when one paſſage tended to light me into a kind of indignation;—it is right you ſhould hear it—If you had the Union, there would be "no "fear of Ireland being too powerful to be go-"verned."—If I had talents for the purpoſe, I ſhould not deſire a better theme than this, to electrify the ſpirit of a free people. But as I promiſed you, I would only ſpeak of this creature for your recreation, I ſhall only ſay, that the plain Engliſh of this ſentence is, that unleſs you ſubmit to an Union, you would become too powerful to be governed by the flagitious principles of his wicked taſk-maſter. There is in ſhort, in this ſpiteful animal, all the ſtrong and natural propenſities to miſchief, happily without a ſingle talent for contrivance.——I have heard it reported within a few days, that he has endeavoured to deny his work, and has wiſhed to ſhift it upon ſome other creature, as wicked and as harmleſs as himſelf. This retrac-

tion is mean, very mean; it is the heartleſs expedient of a culprit, who after a conviction on the cleareſt evidence, would pitifully implore his judge and jury to enter into the merits of his caſe. This has however, reſtored my mind to its original uniformity, and could you read it, you would ſee nothing written on it but the word, *contempt.*

Having trod on this reptile *en paſſant*, let me proceed to the more important conſideration of our common concerns.—— You ſee I have endeavoured to ſhew unto you, the exiſtence many years ago of this plan—I have endeavoured to point your attention to the caution, the ſilence, the dexterity uſed in the Britiſh Cabinet on a vital ſubject of *your* intereſts—I alſo endeavoured to impreſs on your minds the avowed ſyſtem on which it was at different times to be accompliſhed—I have next endeavoured to ſhew how far from ſimilar have been the caſes of Scotland and Ireland; indeed, I went farther; I gave it you as my ſincere opinion, that Scotland has been all but ruined by the Union—I alſo gave you the reaſons and documents on which, I grounded that opinion—I next entered as fully as a work like this required, into the conſideration of thoſe queſtions, which are the only ones, I maintain it,

it, that can be called the cardinal points of any nation's proſperity.—On each of theſe heads I have endeavoured to ſhew, how little Ireland could gain, and how much ſhe *muſt* loſe.—I then proceeded to ſhew how little the connexion between your country and Great Britain, would be likely to receive any additional ſtability by this meaſure; on the contrary I have ſaid what I now think and feel, viz. that there are in it all the principles of ſeparation, for the moſt ſimple of all reaſons, becauſe we ſhall be always glad to get rid of a connexion to which we were *forced*. I have endeavoured alſo, to ſhew how little good ſenſe and reaſon there was in that argument, drawn from the *nature* of our former intercourſe, and laſtly I endeavoured to ſhew unto you the nature, cauſes, and conſequences, of our *irreligious* feuds. —On each and every one of theſe topics, I have convinced my own underſtanding—It is with the ſincerity of a man who loves his country, that I have thought proper to communicate to my countrymen, the reſult of ſome thinking and infinite affection.—But even though I had failed in the diſcuſſion of the various queſtions I took up, yet, would I not for that reaſon yield—Until the lightning of conviction flaſhes on the affirmative ſide of the queſtion, I ſay, you have nothing to do in the mean time, but to take poſt within the entrenchments

entrenchments of national *dignity and pride*—I repeat it——*National dignity and pride.*——Let me tell you in the language of the illuſtrious Burke, that "high and haughty ſentiments," are no inconſiderable guardians of any nation's liberty.—The tranſitions from national dignity to national ſlavery, are neither ſlow nor uncertain.—The nation that can without a pang ſurrender its dignity, will without much difficulty in the proceſs, ſurrender its freedom without a ſtruggle.—Believe me, the great ſecurity of virtue is, the firmneſs with which it reſiſts the *firſt approaches* of vice.—The diſtance between that virtue on which vice has made the ſlighteſt innovation, and vice itſelf, is but chimerical.—The mind that can liſten with patience, to compenſation for national dignity, will by a natural proceſs feel little diſguſt at a ſyſtem of tyranny on the one hand, and ſlavery on the other. As to *terms* therefore, I tell you, they are not to be liſtened to with patience, by a people retaining the ſlighteſt ſpark of the real eſſence of liberty.—What! take from you your conſtitution, and give you terms; take from you the fair form of life, and give you drapery!—What! dreſs up a death's head in all the finery of fantaſtic ornament! No—no, theſe very ornaments are but a *plauſible* covering; draw the drapery aſide, and you ſee but the morbid hideouſneſs of death.—Let no man talk to me of any argument grounded upon imperial

importance

importance:—What! are not whole tracts of territory, large provinces in desolation in the East, and entire islands peopled by the sale of nature in the West, sufficient unto proud imperial Britain—but you get an imperial constitution—you will still have King, Lords, and Commons.—Yes, you will have that parliament which has been for more than six hundred years recording the monuments of its own tyranny and your disgrace—Yes, you will have that parliament from which superior virtue and superior courage extorted the avowal of *your* rights, and the renunciation of *its* wrongs, sitting in vindictive judgment on the affairs of your country—Yes, you will have that parliament, which in the early periods of your history, spurned at the humble remonstrances of your rights, kicked from its doors the petitions of your people, and consigned to splendid infamy the statement of your case.—The conflagration that consumed the *case* of Molyneux, illuminated the *cause* of Ireland—Yes, you will have that parliament, which in the plenitude of its power, exhibited to you nothing but a system of tyranny and usurpation, and in abdicating its power, was forced to take refuge from open oppression, in a system of jealousy and discontent.—Yes, you will have that parliament, which having had recourse to every stratagem of contrivance, to every expedient of evasion and procrastination, on the subject of your constitution,

conſtitution, was at laſt obliged to yield to heroic ſteadineſs, uncommon virtue, and the determined perſeverance of your own people. Let me aſk you, would you not have laughed to ſcorn the terror of the Prætorian Guards in the year 1782?—What are become of the grand landmarks, by which in all countries and in all ages the human mind has been identified? What would you have thought of this meaſure in the year 1783? Would you not have reckoned this meaſure the conſummation of Engliſh tyranny and Iriſh ſlavery?—Would you not have reckoned temperance and moderation on ſuch a ſubject, the unerring ſymptoms of national degradation and debaſement? Would you have ſuffered any man to tamper with your independence, on the ground of a bargain, I aſk you? Would not your mind have ſickened at the very mention of the word Union? No—your mind would have had the illumination and vigor of liberty—no—the very mention of the word would have produced an electric fire, that would have put your people in motion in the moſt retired corner of your country—No! I ſay myriads of arms would have ſtood in hoſtile array, between the menace of the meaſure and the propoſal of it. The records of your country in the year 1783 could not have experienced ſo vile a contamination—What! ſcarcely fifteen years are paſſed ſince that very conſtitution which you regained

gained with ſo much virtue and heroiſm, becomes the ſubject of political barter—is transformed into a commodity of ſale and transfer—What! not ſuffer it to touch the common æra of manhood, but in its ſtate of growing adoleſcence, full of youth and beauty, ſet it up to public auction! What! the Iriſh people turn African merchants, and ſend a being of their own creation into the arms of oppreſſion! What! I ſay, the people of Ireland with more than parricidal wickedneſs and inhumanity, ſell its own child to the higheſt and faireſt bidder! What! will you ſuffer the page of hiſtory to bring you to the recollection of your poſterity, only by the ſtory of your own crimes and their misfortunes! What! will you, with all the bankrupt prodigality of heirſhip, ſpend in your life-time the inheritance that ſhould be deſtined for your children, and leave them no other legacy than your map.—It cannot be—the God of nature, I think, ſays ſo.

I laugh at thoſe who ſay, we are a nation only on ſufferance.—I am a friend—a decided friend—to the connexion with Great Britain, for the reaſons I have already offered—I would leap into the water, and ſtretch out my hand to ſave her, but I will not let her *graſp* me for the uſeleſs and mournful honor of being ingulphed in the ſame deep with her. It is a pitiful expedient in the hands of

theſe men, to menace us with ſeparation; if Great Britain ſhall threaten to ſeparate herſelf from us, we muſt beſeech of her to conſult her own and our intereſts; we muſt do every thing to prevent that fatal meaſure, ſhort of the ſurrender of our rights, our liberties, our laws—I ſay it, I laugh at thoſe who place our liberties upon the caprice or forbearance of any nation upon earth—What was Holland, ſpringing from her marſhes, with a ſcanty, barren territory, and not half our population, at the cloſe of the ſixteenth century? I'll tell you what it was—it was a land of liberty—That ſingle word made every cabin in Holland a fortification, and every Dutchman a hero.—You, too, may continue to be free; your liberty depends but on yourſelves; you have a moſt righteous cauſe. There are not wanting patriots in your Senate—Alas! you have in your metropolis a calumniated patriot, whoſe gigantic talents have ſtamped him as the advocate, ſucceſsful advocate, of liberty. You have another Marcellus, living, as it were, in exile in his native land.—If our liberties are to be ſold, if we are to be betrayed, let us have the ſolitary conſolation of his recorded vote.

In the important conſideration of your *general* proſperity, I had nearly forgotten a ſubject apparently

parently local, but in which all of us have a common concern—I mean the intereſts of this great city; that proud eminence from which I am ſpeaking to the people of Ireland—that very metropolis, whoſe exertions on many occaſions, but particularly on a recent one, contributed ſo much to prop the tottering fabric of the throne.—This ſervice, one would have imagined, deſerved ſome recompenſe—What is to be its recompenſe?—Annihilation—The unremote transformation of the moſt beautiful city in Europe, without exception, into the wretched inſignificance of a common fiſhing-town.—Alas! For what purpoſe have we been hewing large ſtones in the capital? For what purpoſe have our ſumptuous manſions, our ſtately edifices, riſen within our view, unto a degree of enviable ſplendor? Are they the almoſt ſpeaking emblems of public proſperity? They will become the ſilent records of public misfortune.—Are they the almoſt animated ſymbols of public ſpirit?—They will become the chearleſs monuments of public diſgrace.—Mark the curious traveller, whom the hiſtory of your former ſplendor and your calamities may hereafter tempt to your ſhores.—Mark him, while caſting his eyes around he marches in ſepulchral ſilence through your living ſtreets, hearing nought but the raven, ſeeing nought but depopulated magnificence! Mark

him

him tracing by your half-ſtanding walls, the extent of your former circumference, and calculating upon your former population.—Mark him ſurveying with claſſic admiration, that maſſy pile, the ſeat of your learning, the nurſery of your youth, and the pride of your people!—Mark him, I ſay, changing his eye to the left, and catching that bold majeſtic frontiſpiece, that ſtupendous record of your liberties and your ſhame! Mark him turning to his *Cicerone* (to whoſe faithful memory have been entruſted the liſts of your curioſities and the ſtory of your misfortunes) and aſking what's that? That, Sir, *was* the Parliament Houſe, for you muſt know, that Ireland had once a Parliament.—Mark him looking eaſtward, and catching through the frightful viſto of ruin and deſolation, that dumb, but eloquent token of commercial proſperity! What's that? That, Sir, *was* the Cuſtom-houſe, for you muſt know, that Dublin once had trade.—All, all theſe—but deſpondency is the argument of ſlaves.—There *was* a time, when Iriſhmen of all deſcriptions cluſtered round the drooping genius of incarcerated commerce, led her from her gloomy cell, into the light of Heaven, decked her with angel's wings, and floated her to the extremities of the terraqueous globe. There *was* a time, I ſay, when the children of Hibernia, forgetting (oh that I could ſay annihilating

ing) their *irreligious* feuds and prejudices, undertook the heroic taſk of her enlargement. They ſucceeded, for armed liberty is invincible; and as with one hand they dragged from her fair form, thoſe unjuſt and diſgraceful chains with which ſhe had been bound, ſo with one voice, they proclaimed their proud victory to the world.—Theſe were acts of public ſpirit;—theſe were acts of public virtue.—That ſpirit and that virtue may have ſlept—I think, I truſt, they have not died.

FINIS.

BRITISH MUSEUM
28 47
MAR